

To the Reader.

Epistles of this nature, are unusually swell'd up to their proper bulke with large commendations, either of the workes, (to which they are prefixt) or of their Authours, or of both. I intend to wave this custome, though having a sure foundation, and fitting materialls, to build as sumptuous a structure in this kinde, as others have done in the like cases. Yet thinke not, that this intention proceeds from an unwillingnesse to pay that tribute of praise, which is justly due to the name of any man: I acknowledge the equitie of the Apostles precept,^a to render honour to whom honour doth belong: it comes rather from an indisposition, publiquely to meddle in this great controversie, (wherein the whole world stands engag'd) viz. to whom this golden apple is to be given; on whose head this crowne of honour is to be set. Whom one man approves, another dislikes; whom a third doth reverence, a fourth disdaineth: and such is our weakenes, and partialitie in judging, that no perfect agreement can be expected, till the ^a revelation of the righteous judgement of God, who shall render to every man according to his deedes. I shall not therefore endeavor to steale away the heart of any man, after the Authour of the Reply, or his opinion, by speaking high and excellent things of him: all that I will say, is onely this, I wish him as much honour and respect from the world, as hee is worthy of, which (I am perswaded) is more then he lookes for, and as much as his greatest adversary can justly challenge: but to give in the full estimate, or precisely to set downe, what is his due above his fellowes, I am unwilling, but far more unable; yet something I could doe this way, and I can hardly resist the strength of my provocations hereunto, but I forbear; not that I dread Mr. Walkers thunderbolts, to be censur'd by him as a rude

^aRomans
13.7,8.

^aRomans
2.5,6.

To the Reader.

impudent, Socinian Sectarie : but because I desire that Mr. Goodwins reputation might bee rais'd in none, by any other engine, then by a reall and evident conviction of his deservings : for though to thinke well of those we know not, is counted charity ; yet to applaud, and admire any, upon no surer ground then the generall vote, is folly, and may prove dangerous : the wombe of our times hath beene too abundantly fruitfull with instances herein : many have we seene cast upon perplexing inconveniencies, and some yoked with desperate errors, and that by those whose persons they have ignorantly wondered after And I am perswaded, that many tenents in religion (which are now confidently given, and greedily received as wholesome foode) would hardly downe, were they not wrapt up in the sweet fame of such or such mens names. I would not that Truth her selfe were entertayned upon such termes : certainly she accompts none her true subjects, but those onely, who are brought under her scepter, by the love of her commanding beauty ; not by the parts, learning, holinesse of her choysest agents. Concerning the Reply (here presented to thy consideration) I gather thus much from the Authours ^a words : that it was a worke of recreation, not of labour ; and therefore no marvell, if it came into the world with a smiling countenance : and though in this respect, it may be judged by some unlike its father, who is of a wonderfull grave and sober temper ; yet upon a strict view, many of his lyneaments are to bee seene in the face of it ; I meane, soundnesse of judgement, quickenesse of wit, fairenesse of carriage, yea and mercy too towards his adversary : for had he stricke him in every place, where hee found him naked, hee had left him so blacke and blew, that even Mr. Walkers friends would hardly say, this is hee. If any shall except, against the manner of managing this warfare,

a Vid
Preface.

To the Reader.

For fare, and censure his expressions as too light, to hold
with the weightinesse of his matter; I referre such
satisfaction to his owne preface. As far as I under-
stand, no wiser course can be taken, to charme downe the
virent of anger into sobernesse, then to deale with it in a
pleasant way: whether M^r. Walker doth strongly sym-
pathe with this turbulent passion, none will question,
as such as are strangers to his dealings: and I verily
beleeve, when the Authour put his Reply into this dresse,
he had respect to him alone, to whom he privately sent it,
not once deeming (as I conceive) that ever it should be
look't upon by so many, and such judicious eyes, as it is
now likely to fall under. For it is probable, that neither
he nor M^r. W. when first they joyned their heads and
pens together for the framing of these Tracts, intended
to scatter them abroad by the hand of the presse. Indeede
M^r. Walker when he received the Reply, promised the
messengers to print both that, and his owne Answer;
which had beene faire, and worthy the man, he would bee
taken to be. But while the performance thereof was ex-
pected, he brings into the world, a confused medley of the
strangest Socianisme and Christianisme, that was ever
heard of. By what figure hee will bee able to salve the
breach of his promise, I cannot guesse, though hee hath
forc't them to doe him service (as hee conceives) else-
where, yet I much feare they will here all faile him: for
through the whole compasse of that his discourse, I can
see nothing of the Reply; I confesse he onely mentions a
scurrilous Lybell fraught with lies, forgeries, absurdi-
ties, contradictions, blasphemies, sent forth under the
name of a Reply: but I can hardly perswade my selfe that
he would so farre abuse the world, as to make it beleeve,
that by this Lybell hee means M^r. Goodwins Reply.
But if his passion so farre transported him beyond his in-

To the Reader.

tellectualls, as to charge so innocent a peece with such capitoll crimes; I pittie the man; and expect its discharge from the hands of such as are not infested with so mortall an enemy unto reason. Nor hath hee kept touch with his promise about his owne answer: for though the most part hereof may bee gathered from thence, yet is it made so unlike to what it was, by adding something, and subtracting others; that in consideration hereof, it was thought requisite, to print it in the very shape, in which it came at first from betweene his hands, (for to this alone hath the Reply reference) and to couple both it and the Reply in one volume.

I am conscious of no other designe, that the publisher propounded to himselfe, but onely this: to clear the Reply and the Author of it, from those false and foule imputations of lying, forging, &c. and to wash off from the face of that truth, they pleade for, those blacke colours of Socinianisme, and Arminianisme, which Mr. Walkers pencill hath drawne over it; that appearing to the eye of the world out of his cloathing; their innocency might bee acknowledged in the judgements and consciences of reasonable men. The accomplishment of which designe, will (I dare say) satisfyingly recompence his cost and labour; and enlarge his heart towards the God of peace and truth, who hath given successe to so just, so pious, so commendable an undertaking.

Farwell.

AN EPITOME OF Mr. *Walkers* Answer.

OR

Speciall receipt by a moderne Divine a-
gainst the Dangerous infection of an
Orthodox Truth.

R Ecipe 21. folio's or leaves of papyrus, as close
written as may well be read. *Sofinus* and *Armi-*
hinus well beaten together, and strained through a
course boulder of an English discourse: A handfull
of good Scriptures carelessly gathered, and well
steeped in the standing water of a new laid interpre-
tation. Add hereunto two or three Hebrew roots:
of reading a sufficient quantity: of Learning about
a third part: Of the hearb called *ερίδαλλος* in Eng-
lish lack-love, 6 leaves (at the least) of blacke
tongue-wort some fiftene slips: of tropes and
metonymies gathered where they never grew as
many as you can come by: of the drugg called *di-*
abolico-pseudo-lobetico 12 ounces: of the simple cal-
led insultory or affasfetidea as much: of the sweet
and savory hearb discretion, halfe a scruple.

Let all these bee made up into the body of a dis-
course and swallowed downe without chewing up-
on a full stomacke, and take heede of drinking any
sound interpretation after them, and there is little
feare that the truth will ever doe you any harme.

Probatum est.

gathered unto God, and by one Spirit Baptised, and united together into one spirituall body with him their spirituall head; and made lively and sensible partakers of his perfect *obedience*, *righteousnesse*, and full satisfaction for *redemption*, *remission of sins*, *justification* and perfect *salvation* should become *Abrahams* faithfull seed, and partakers of the same reward, and should wee more seeke the reward of *blessednesse*, by the *righteousnesse* of their owne workes, performed according to the tenour of the *Law* in every mans owne person, but in the Lord *Iesus Christ* who is the *Iehovah Zidkenu*, the Lord our *righteousnes*, and God, the lot and portion of every true *beleever*; upon *Abrahams* beleeving of the *promise*, and firmly without staggering applying to himselfe this *blessing* promised, and upon his full perswasion that God who promised out of his free *grace*, was by his power able to performe though he by course of Nature, and by reason of the deadnesse of *Sarabs* wombe, seemed and indeed was incapable of that *blessing*; God the Lord counted this to him for *righteousnesse*, that is, accepted and accounted him for a *righteous* man, as indeed he was not for any *workes* of his owne, or by any *righteousnesse* performed in his owne person according to the *Law*, but by the *righteousnesse* of *faith*; that is, the *righteousnesse* of *Christ* apprehended and applyed by *Faith*, for being thus justified by *faith*, and having this Communion with *Christ* of his full satisfaction and *righteousnesse*, God becomes in *Christ* our sheild and exceeding great reward.

The Corrupt exposition of the Apostles wordes, by the Hereicke Socinus, and his followers the Arminians, and other fanaticall Sectaries.

They all hold and obstinately affirme, that *Abrahams* beleeving and his *faith* (taken in a proper literall sense.

sense without any trope) was counted to him for *righteousnes* instead of all *righteousnes*, which either *Abraham* him selfe in his own person, or any surety in his owne person, or any surety in his behalfe, could performe to the *Law* of *God*; And upon these words thus wrested; they build all their hereticall *Doctrines* and opinions, concerning *justification* of the faithfull before *God*, to wit; First, that *faith* as it is in every *beleever* a gift of *God*, even as it is inherent in him, and is his owne *faith* and beleeving, is the onely thing which *God* of his grace and mercy, and out of his absolute soveraigne power, and dominion is pleased to ordaine, appoynt, and account for all the *righteousnesse* which a man shall have for his *justification*, though in truth and in strictnesse of the *Law*, and according to the rule of *justice* it is no *righteousnes*; being weake oftentimes and full of infirmities.

That the spirit of *God* by the *Apostle* in these words, did not intend or meane any of the Communion of the *righteousnes* and perfect obedience performed by *Christ* to the *Law* as our surety and in our stead, nor any imputation of that *righteousnes* to every true *beleever* for *justification*, nor *Gods* accepting of the faithfull for righteous by their communion of that *righteousnes* applied, possessed, and enjoyed by *faith*.

By *faith* and beleeving they doe not understand that gift and worke of *Gods* spirit in the elect regenerate, and sanctified, by which they doe beleeve and are perswaded that they are in *Christ*, and *Christ* is their head, and they as members have communion of all his benefits, even of his full satisfaction and perfect *righteousnes* for remission of all their sinnes, and for justification; and by this perswasion and beleeving they have a sweet and lively sence, feeling and fruition of *Christs* satisfaction and *righteousnes*, and rest on them as on the covering and propitiation of their sinnes, and their *righteousnes*

by which they stand righteous before God and are justified; but by *faith* and *beleeving* they understand no more but a confidence in God: that he will performe his *promises* made in *Christ*, and an assent unto his word that it is true; the tenour of which word and *promises* they conceive to be this, that *Christ* in his pure perfect humane nature, by his *righteousnes*, sufferings and *obedience* unto death, hath merited such high favour with God. that God in honour to him, is pleased to accept and account the faith of them that beleeve him to bee a sufficient *Saviour*, for *righteousnes*, and requires noe other *righteousnes* to constitute them, and make them after any sort formally righteous in their *justification*.

4 When they acknowledge that *Christ* his perfect satisfaction and *righteousnes*, is the meritorious cause of our *justification*, they doe not meane, that *Christ* his satisfaction and *righteousnes* are communicated to us, and by *faith* so apprehended and possessed that wee thereby are indeed, and in Gods account righteous before God and are justified, and they deserve that hee should so account us for them, but this is their mind and meaning that *Christ* by his *righteousnes*, and *obedience*, hath merited that God for his sake should account *faith* to us for *righteousnes*; without either our owne *workes* of the *Law*, or his *righteousnes* imputed to us, and made ours by communion, and when they say, *faith* is imputed for *righteousnes* as an instrument: they meane not as the spirituall hand or instrument, applying *Christ* his *righteousnes*, to bee after a sort the formall *righteousnes* of the *beleever*, but that *faith* as it is the instrument by which the *beleever* doth beleeve that *Christ* hath purchased this favour, that *faith* should be the onely thing accounted to him for *righteousnes*.

The Oribodoxe Exposition I will prove and confirme from the wordes of the Apostle himselfe ; and other strong Arguments in the first place ; and afterwards will confute and overthrow the Hereticall Exposition.

The true Exposition defended.

FOr the right understanding of the *Apostles* wordes three things are first to be considered and explained : First, what is here meant by *faith* and beleevving. Secondly, what *righteousnes* is here meant. Thirdly what is meant by imputation.

By *faith* in this place wee must not understand that naturall habit, and power which is common to all reasonable men, who upon their knowledge of things spoken or promised, doe give willing assent unto them that they are true, either for the Authority of the speaker, whom they doe respect and judge to bee faithfull : or because they see good reason in the things spoken and promised, and if the things promised tend to their owne good, they rest upon them confidently, and perswade themselves that they are sure and certaine of them already, or shall receive and enjoy them in due time without faile. But here, by *faith* we are to understand that supernaturall giift and grace of beleevving wrought in the elect, regenerate by the *spirit* shed on them abundantly through *Iesus Christ*, *Tit. 3. 6.* which is therefore called most holy *faith*, *Iude 20.* this *faith* agreeeth with the other in these foure poynts.

First, as that is an habit and power of beleevving, so is this, secondly, as that containes in it, *notitiam in intellectu*, a knowledge and notice of the things spoken & beleevved; so doth this; And as that containes in it *assensum in voluntate* an assent of the wil, so doth this also; And as that *faith* when it goeth no further is called historical;

4. so this also : And as that *faith* when it reacheth to good things promised to our selves particularly, to apply them and rest on them, hath also *fiduciam in corde & affectionibus*, a trust and confidence of the heart and affections in it; so hath this also, and is cald a firme perswasion, trust, confidence; but they differ in divers things. First that is a naturall power or habit. This is spirituall, wrought in men by the *Spirit of God*, dwelling in them and uniting them to *Christ* in one mysticall body. Secondly that hath in it no knowledge but naturall arising from light of naturall reason, nor any assent of the will or confidence in the heart and affections; but such as are drawne, stirred up, and wrought, by meanes of naturall light and common causes; this hath in it a *spirituall* knowledge arising from the *spirit of God*, enlightning the understanding; the *Spirit* also enclines and moves the will to give assent, and confirms the heart with confidence and firme perswasion. Thirdly that is common to all reasonable men; This is proper to the *elect, regenerate, and sanctified* by the holy *Ghost* shed on them through *Christ*; and is the first and the radicall grace and vertue of renovation. 4. That hath for the object or things beleaved, either naturall and worldly things onely, or things heavenly and supernaturall, seene and discern'd through the darke mist of naturall reason and assented to, & rested on with a carnall and un-sanctified will and heart. This hath for the object, things supernaturall, and heavenly and spirituall, discerned by supernaturall light, assented to with an holy and sanctified will: confirmed to the heart by a *spirituall* sence: and sweet taste of the things promised, wrought by the holy *Spirit* in the true beleever, apprehending and applying them.

But to come neere to the *Text*, the beleaving which the *Apostle* speakes of in the 3. *verse*, and also in the 9. and 22. *verses*, is the *faith* and beleaving of *Abraham*, who divers yeares before this beleaving which is
said

said to be counted to him for *righteousnes*, was called
 out of his owne Country: and by *faith* obeyed Gods
 calling, and went and sojourned in the Land promised
 to him and his seed, as appeares *Heb. 11. 8. 9.* he had
 overcome and slaughtered foure mighty Kings, and their
 victorious armies by *faith* and *confidence* in Gods *promi-*
ses; and *Melchizedeck King of Salem the Priest of the*
most High God, had blessed him (as we read *Gen. 14.*)
 and after these things the *Lord* appeared and spake to
Abraham and said, feare not, *I am thy shield, and thy*
exceeding great reward, and withall hee renewed his
promise of the blessed *seed*, by meanes of which *seed*
 all the families of the Earth should be blessed in *Abra-*
ham, and should become his faithfull children; besides
 his naturall *seed* and posterity which should come of the
Sonne and Heire of his owne bowells, as appeares
Gen. 15. 1. 4. These were the *promises* which God
 made to *Abraham*, and which *Abraham* beleevved to be
 true, and resting upon the *Lord* by firme *faith* and be-
 liefe for the performance of them, the *Lord* counted it
 to him for *righteousnes*, *Gen. 15. 6.* or, as the *Apostle*
 expresseth the same sentence in the same sence, though
 in wordes somewhat different, it was counted to him,
verse 5. even *faith* was reckoned to him for *righteousnes*,
verse. 9.

Now this *faith* and beleevving was first an holy spiri-
 tuall *beleefe*: and the *faith* of a man long before called of
 God, and sanctified by his *Spirit*, and made obedient to
 God and his word. Secondly, It was a beleefe not on-
 ly of the *promise* of *Christ* the blessed *seed* in generall;
 but more specially that *Christ* according to the *flesh*,
 should come out of his owne bowells, and that by *Christ*
 the *Sonne of God* made man of his *seed*, the redemption
 both of him, and of all his faithfull *seed*, that is, all
 true beleevvers should be wrought and performed, Gods
 wrath appeased, the *Law* fulfilled, *Justice* satisfied,
 perfect *righteousnes* brought in for their *justification*, and
 by

by his and their union with *Christ* by one spirit, and Communion of all his *benefits*, they should have *God* for their portion and reward, for their *sheild* and defence and should not need to seeke the blessing, and reward of eternall life from their owne *workes*, or their owne *righteousnes*; and fulfilling of the *Law* in their owne persons, but meerey from the free *grace* of *God*, and of his free gift in *Christ*, as a reward of *Christs* *righteousnesse* freely given to them, and of them apprehended by faith and beleevyng. Thirdly, this faith of *Abraham* was not a weake, but a strong *faith*, and beliefe without staggering, even a full perswasion, that *God* who quickneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not, as if they were, and was able to make good, and to performe what hee had promised; yea it was a beleevyng in hope against hope; that *God* could out of a dead body and womb raise up a lively *seed*, and make them spiritually righteous: who are by nature and according to the *Law* wicked sinners. All these things are manifest by the places before cited, *Gen: 15.* and by the expresse wordes of the *Apostle* in this chap: from the tenth *verse* to the end of the Chapter. And thus you see what is meant by *faith* which is here said to be counted for righteous.

Secondly, the *righteousnes* here meant is not the *righteousnes* which is according to the strictnesse and tenour of the *Law*; that is, *righteousnes* of a mans own *workes*, performed by every man in his owne person to the *Law* of *God*; for the *Apostle* doth dispute altogether against that *righteousnes* and proves, that neither *Abraham* was justified or counted of *God* righteous for it, as appears in the 2. 5. 6. 13. *verses*, nor any other at any time, as appears in the Chapter before. And *Chap. 8. 3.* and 9. 32. 10. 3. But here is meant an Evangelicall *righteousnes*, which doth not consist in any worke or workes performed by a man himselfe in his owne person, nor in any grace or vertue inherent in himselfe;

selfe, but is a *righteousnesse* which God of his owne free grace doth impute to the true *Beleever*; who by one *Spirit* is united to *Christ*, and hath communion with him, and is called the *righteousnes of Faith*, and doth exclude legal *justification*, by *righteousnesse* of a mans owne *workes*, as appears in the whole discourse of the *Apostle* in this and the former Chapter, and in diverse other places of this *Epistle*, especially *ver. 13.* of this 4 *Chap.* and in *Chap. 3. 27. 28.*

Thirdly, the phrase of *imputing*, or counting a thing to one signifies both in the Old and New *Testament*, an Act of judgement and estimation, by which a thing is judged, esteemed, reckoned, and accounted to be as it is indeed, and then it is *just*, and according to *truth*: but when a thing is counted, or judged, thought, and esteemed, to be as it is not, then it is *unjust*, and not according to *truth*. Now Gods thoughts are alwaies *just*, and his judgement is according to *truth*. *Rom. 2. 2.* And therefore a *just imputing and counting*, is here ment, for God doth account, and Iudge of all persons, and things, so as they are. Of *unjust counting*, and *imputing* falliely, we have some examples in *Scripture*, as *1 Kings 1. 21.* where *Bathsheba* saith to *David*. *I and my Sonne Solomon shall be counted offenders*, that is, *usurping Adonijah and his wicked Company, will so esteeme and judge us*: of *reputing*, and counting truely as the thing is, we have examples also, as *Nehemiah 13. 13.* where it is said of the chosen *Levites*, that they were counted *faithfull*, viz. upon former experience of their *faithfulness*, and therefore the Office of distributing to their *Brethren*, was counted to them. And *Levit 17. 4.* where it is said, *Blood shall be imputed to that man, he hath shed blood, and shall be cut off from among his people.* And *Psal. 22. 30.* *a seed shall serve him, it shall be counted to the Lord for a generation.*

Moreover, this word *impute* or *count*, signifies sometimes in the most proper sense a bare Act of the *Judgment* and *thought*, as *Pro. 17. 28.* where a *Foole* is said

to be counted wise when he holdeth his peace ; that is, men for the present judge or thinke him wise , at least in that point of *silence*.

Sometimes it signifies in a more full sense, not onely *thinking, Judging,* and *counning persons* to be good or bad, just, or unjust, innocent, or guilty ; but also dealing with them, and using them accordingly, as in the places before named, 1 *Kings* 1. 21. *Nehem.* 13. 13. and *Levit.* 17. 4. and *Psal.* 22. 30. also 1 *Sam.* 23. 15. where *Abimelech* purging himselfe before *Saul*, from the offence of conspiracy with *David* against him (as *Doeg* had falsely accused him) saith, *Let not the King impute anything unto his servant*, that is, Let him not thinke or judge his servant *guilty*, nor deale with him, or use him as a Conspiratour.

Sometimes it signifies by a Metonymie of the *cause* for the *effect*, condemning, and punishing an offence in a guilty person as he hath deserved, and to deale with him and use him as hee is justly thought and judged to have deserved, as 2 *Sam.* 19. 19. *Shimei* said, *Let not my Lord impute iniquity unto me* : he doth not desire that *David* would not thinke, nor judge, nor count his *iniquitie* to be no *iniquitie*, that had beene against all reason, but that for the *satisfaction* which he had made, in coming first of all to the house of *Joseph* to meet *David*, and to bring him againe to his Kingdome, *David* would graciously pardon his offence, and not proceed against him, and punish him as justly, and worthy of punishment.

Sometimes it signifies by a Metaphor, to count one thing as it were another, or no better then another, or of the same value, as *Prov.* 27. 14. where a flattering salutation or blessing, given with a loud voyce, is said to be counted a *Curse*, that is, esteemed no better then if it were a *Curse*.

Sometimes to use one, as if he counted him of another Condition, as *Gen.* 31. 15. where it is said of *Laban*, *that* he

he counted his Daughters strangers; that is, used them as if he had counted them strangers: and *Iob. 31. 10.* where *Iob* saith, that God counteth him for his enemy; that is, afflicteth, and plagueth him, as if he counted him an enemy.

Sometimes the word signifies to *skore up*, or to put upon a mans account or reckoning, either the offence or debt which he himselfe runs into; as *Rom. 5. 13.* where it is said, that sinne is not imputed when there is no Law: that is, it is not so *skored up*, that men are punished for it, and it is not judged and punished in them, or the debt which he takes upon him for another: as *Philemon verse 18.* If he hath wronged thee, or is indebted to thee, put that on mine account, that is, impute and count it to me, and set it on my *skore*.

Now the severall significations of the severall wordes being thus laid open, I proceed more particularly to the true sense and meaning of every word in these speeches, and to shew how far the speeches may be extended. And first, by *Faith*, and *beleeving* which is counted to every true beleever (and was counted to *Abraham*) for righteousness. I understand here (according to the judgment of the most Orthodox Divines) the true holy spirituall *faith*, and *beleeve*, which is before shewed to have bin in *Abraham*, and which is proper to the elect regenerate, and is said to be imputed to them for righteousness: By righteousness is here meant Evangelical righteousness, (which is opposed to the legal righteousness of workes, which is inherent in every man, and is every mans fulfilling of the Law in his owne person) even the perfect satisfaction and righteousness of *Christ*, (God and man) our mediator and surety which he the Son of God, in mans Nature performed to the Law, and which is apprehended by every true beleever, and applied to himselfe by a lively *faith* and whereof he hath communion and is truly made partaker by his Spirituall union with *Christ*, of whose mysticall body he is a member, being

Baptized and engrafted therein by one Spirit. By the *imputing* and *counting* of that *faith* for *righteousnesse* to *Abraham*, and to every one of his *faithfull seed*, is here ment Gods setting of *Christs righteousness* on the skore, and putting it on the account of every true *beleever*, and and his judging, esteeming, and counting them no more guilty of sinne, but perfectly *righteous* by that *Evangelical righteousness*, which is called the *righteousnesse of God*. 2 Cor. 5. last *ver.* because it is the *righteousnesse of God*, performed in our Nature, and the *righteousnesse of faith*, and not of *workes*, because the *faithfull* obtaine, and enjoy, and apply it by *beleeving*, and not by working the *workes* of the *Law*. Rom. 4. 11. 13. For the confirmation of this exposition, and justifying of this *truth*, we need seek no further *Arguments*, but such as may be gathered from the Apostles owne words, as in other of his Epistles, so especially in this to the *Romans*.

The first argument is drawne from the wordes of the *Apostle* in the second chap: of this *Epistle*, *verse 26.* where this word λογισθήσεται (as it signifies) to be *imputed* or *counted*, is first used; If (saith hee) *the uncircumcision* keep the *righteousnes of the Law*, shall not his *uncircumcision* bee counted for *Circumcision*? by *uncircumcision* (in the first clause) we cannot understand the *foreskinne* of the flesh not cut off, it is most absurd, and against common sense and reason to thinke or to suppose that it can or could performe and keepe the *righteousnes of the Law*, but by *uncircumcision* is ment a Gentile not *circumcised*, as *Beza*, (the most learned, judicious, and accurate Critik and searcher out of the sense of every word and sentence in the new Testament) doth expound the word, and so we have in this word a Metonymie of the a junct for the Subject: The same word in the second clause (as *Beza* also well observes) doth not here signify the *foreskin* or *uncircumcision* in a proper sense (for that cannot but most falsely be reputed and counted for

circum-

circumcision; because they are contradictories one to another) but the state and condition of him who is *uncircumcised*, even the outward state of Gentilisme; and here is another Metonymie of the same kind, even the signe put for the thing signified, yea it signifies not the state of a Gentile or *uncircumcised* man barely considered in it selfe, but as comprehending in it the *righteousnesse of the Law*, which the man *uncircumcised* hath kept and performed in that state, as the words necessarily imply; for the Apostle doth not here suppose onely *uncircumcision*, but the observation of the *righteousnesse of the Law* in the state of *uncircumcision*; and so here is a Metalepsis or double trope, even a metonymie also of the thing conteyning for the thing contained, that is, of the Subject for the adjunct, and also of the cause for the effect; that is, the man in the state of *uncircumcision* keeping the *righteousnes of the law*, for the *righteousnes of the law* by him performed. By *circumcision* we cannot understand the outward cutting away of the foreskin of the flesh, neither taken literally and carnally, as the corrupt Jewes did take it, for a worke of *righteousnes* and *obedience* to the *Law* for *justification*, so it was an *obligation*, by which the *circumcised* was bound under pain of cutting off for ever to performe the whole *Law*, as appears *Gal. 5.3*. And for a *righteous* Gentile to be brought under this bondage was no benefit, but a miserable condition; neither can *circumcision* be here taken sacramentally, as it was an outward signe and *seale of the righteousnes of faith*, and of *Mortification*, and of all *vertues of Holinesse* by which men are *sanctified to God* and become his *peculiar people*, for *Ismael*, *Esau* and all the prophane persons of *Israel* *circumcised*, were partakers of the outward *signe* and *Sacrament of circumcision*, and yet were destitute of the *inward Grace signified*; And in neither respect can *uncircumcision*, or the person *uncircumcised*, nor Gentilisme, together with the keeping the *righteousnes of the Law* be counted truly for *circumcision*, nor reckoned in the

place of it; But here by *circumcision* is meant the *circumcision of the heart* in the *Spirit*, and not in the *Letter*, for so the *Apostle* doth expound himselfe *verse 29.* the (word λογισθησεται shall be counted) signifies here in a full sence *judging, counting, approving, accepting and using accordingly.*

Now all laid together the meaning of the *Apostle* in these wordes is this, that if a man *uncircumcised* doe keepe all the *Commandements*, and performe the *righteousnes of the Law*, his state of *Gentilisme* comprehending in it the *righteousnes of the Law*, shall be counted and accepted for the state of an *holy and righteous man circumcised in heart*, and hee though *uncircumcised in flesh*, and a *Gentile in outward estate*, shall be counted of God a *true Israelite without guile*, truly *circumcised with inward spirituall circumcision of the heart in the spirit*, whose praise is not of men, but of God. This sence and meaning of the wordes, and of this phrase is so cleere and manifest, and so perfectly agreeable to all true reason, that none can deny it, unlesse hee will set himselfe to rebell against the light; and this phrase being the same which this *Apostle* doth use againe, where hee mentions counting and imputing of *faith* and *beleeving for righteousnes to Abraham*, and to every true *beleever*, doth give light for the discovering of the true sence and meaning of the wordes, the phrase being the very same. Wherefore if we will follow the *Apostle* himselfe, and tread after him in the same steps, being the surest guide, and best expounder of his owne wordes and meaning, we must by *Abrahams beleeving* by a *Metalepsis* or double trope, with our learned Divines, understand *Abraham standing in the state of a true beleever, united by one spirit unto God in Christ, and having communion of his satisfaction and righteousnes, which were of force from the beginning to save and iustifie, and to make God the reward of the beleever.* And by *faith imputed or counted for righteousnes*, wee must not underitand *faith* in a proper sence, but

but by a double trope, for the state and condition of a true faithfull man, and for that which faith comprehends and includes in it, even the perfect righteousness and full satisfaction of Christ God and man: By righteousness we must understand the state of a man justified, or Evangelicall righteousness communicated to the justified man, and made his for iustification. And by counting and imputing we must understand the accepting, approving, esteeming & iudging of Abraham, and every true beleever, so soone as he appears faithfull to be in the state of a man iustified, and Gods setting on his skore, and counting, & imputing to him being faithfull, the righteousness of Christ apprehended by faith, which is indeed and in truth made his by spirituell union and communion with Christ.

Hear then the true paraphrase upon the Apostles words, shewing the true sense and meaning of them, Abraham upon a true inward spirituell sense of his union and communion with Christ, did beleve and was surely persuaded that God was his reward, and this his beleefe and faith comprehending Christ for righteousness, and containing in it after a sort the righteousness of Christ, God counted it to him for righteousness; that is, set it on his skore, and reckoned it to him for iustification, and judged, esteemed and accepted him for a man truly righteous, as indeed he was, and so whosoever doth not rest on his owne workes for iustification, nor seeketh thereby to be iustified, but by faith seeketh that righteousness which makes him righteous by the communion of it, when in himselfe by nature he is ungodly, his faith comprehending in it Christ and his righteousness, is counted for righteousness, because it settles him in the state of a righteous man; and Gods setting on his skore Christs satisfaction and righteousness, doth accept him for a man iustified.

A second argument confirming the exposition, is drawn from the Apostles owne wordes in the fourth verse: now to him that worketh, the reward is not reckoned of grace, but of debt, whereby it is manifest that the thing counted

counted for *righteousnes* brings with it a *reward*, also to the *beleever* which is counted, not of debt, but of *grace*, now there is nothing which can bring the *reward* of *eternall life*, and *Glory* to a *beleever*, when it is counted to him and set on his skore, but the perfect *righteousnes* and *satisfaction* of *Jesus Christ*; that, all grant to bee meritorious of *eternall life* to all that are partakers of it, and because the *communion* and *imputation* of it is of *Gods free grace*, and the *faith* by which we receive, apply and enjoy it, is *Gods free gift*, therefore the *reward*, to wit, *eternall life* is of *free Grace*, and not of debt, as the *Apostle* here saith. Whereupon the the Conclusion followes, that the thing counted for *righteousnes* is the *righteousnes* of *Christ* apprehended by *faith*.

Thirdly, in the 6. and 7. verses the *Apostle* teacheth expressely; that the thing *imputed* by *God* is *righteousnes*; and such a *righteousnes*, as being *imputed*, brings *forgivenesse* of iniquity, and covers *sinnes*, and so makes the *beleever* blessed. Now there is no *righteousnes* to be found among all mankind, besides *Christs* perfect *righteousnes* and full *satisfaction*; and that is a perfect *propitiation* for all *sinnes*, and an *expiation* of all iniquity to them who by *faith* have put on *Christ*, therefore it is the true *righteousnes* which is *imputed* to every *beleever* for *justification*.

Fourthly, that which is here said to be *imputed* to *Abraham*, and to every *beleever*, is for *righteousnesse* to *justification*, for the discourse of the *Apostle* here, and in the 3. and 5. chap. is altogether of *justifying*, as appears chap. 3. verse 20. 24. 26. 28. 30 and also chap. 5. 1. 16. 18, 19; in all which places he mentions *justification* and *justifying*; And here in this 4. chap. he brings *Abrahams* example, and *Dauids* testimony to shew how we are *justified*; now there is nothing which doth serve to us for *righteousnes* to *justification*, but that which is found in *Christ* our *Mediatour*, even his *righteousnes* and perfect fulfilling of the *Law*; so this *Apostle* doth plainly

plainly affirme and teach *chap. 5. 19. and chap. 8. 3. 4. and Chap. 10. 3. 4.* Therefore this *righteousnes* is upon the true *beleeving* of *Abraham*, and the faithfull counted and *imputed* to them, and set on their skore for their *iustification*.

Fifely, that *exposition* of a phrase or speech of *Scripture*, which is warranted by other places of *Scripture*, wherefore that *phrase* is used, is to be judged the best *exposition*; this none can with any reason deny, for the *Spirit* of *God* speaking in *Scripture*, is the best *expounder* of his owne meaning. Now this *exposition*, that *imputing* or *counting* a thing for *righteousnes*, is no more but declaring a man thereby to be *righteous*, and giving him the Testimony of *righteousnes*, is warranted by other *Scriptures* wheresoever it is used. Therefore this is to be judged the best *exposition*.

For confirmation of the *assumption* or *minor* we have that place of holy *Scripture*, *Psal. 106.* in which onely and no where else, a thing is said to be *imputed* or *counted* to a man for *righteousnes*; viz. *Phineas*, his godly zealous act of executing judgement on *Zimri*, and *Cofbi*, then *Phineas* stood up (saith the *Psalmist*) and executed judgement, and that was *counted* to him for *righteousnes*, now no man can understand, that this act was *accepted* of *God* for *righteousnes* to *justification*, for then a man may be *iustified* before *God* by one godly and zealous act of his owne, which is that which the *Apostle* utterly condemneth for a grosse error, and bends his whole discourse against it. The true sense and meaning of this *phrase* is no more but this, that *Phineas* performing such a godly zealous act, as is proper to a faithfull *righteous* man onely, who hath the *Spirit* of *regeneration*, and of *sanctification* dwelling in him: uniting him to *Christ*, and making him by *faith* a true partaker of his *righteousnes*, *God* upon this act gave him the Testimony of *righteousnes*: and declared him to be a *righteous* man truly *iustified*. Therefore the

D

phrase

phrase of *imputing* or *counting* faith for *righteousnes*, signifieth no more but this, that the true *beleever* is counted a *righteous* man, and God giveth him the Testimony of *righteousnes*, because he is indeed partaker of *Christs* *righteousnes*, which he hath apprehended and applied by *faith*. If I should insist upon humane testimonies, and the opinions of Orthodox *expositours* of these wordes both ancient and *moderne* for the further prooffe of this *exposition*, a large volume would be little enough: for the particular rehearsing of them all, let these five arguments suffice.

The Confutation of the false exposition made by Socinus, and other Hereticks his Disciples; as Wotton, Goodwin, and their Companions.

First, whereas they hould, that *faith* in a proper *literall* sense; that is, considered in it selfe without relation to any other thing, is counted to every true *beleever* for *righteousnes* to *iustification*, and God requirerh in and of us, no other thing for *righteousnes*, neither our *workes* performed in our owne persons, according to the *Law*, nor *Christs* perfect *righteousnes*, and fulfilling of the *Law*, made ours by *spirituall union* and *communion*, and accepted of God for us. This I prove to be false, *hereticall*, and *blasphemous* by these Arguments following.

First, *Faith* taken in a proper sense, is a part of our *conformity* and *obedience* to the *Law* of God, which above all things requires that we give honour to God, by *beleeving* him and his word, and *trusting* in him as our onely *Rock*, and the God of our *strength* and *salvation*. They therefore teaching, That *faith* in a proper sense is counted for *righteousnes*, do teach, that we are *iustified* by a *worke* of *obedience* to the *Law* performed in our owne persons, and that this is the onely *righteousnes* which God requires any way of us
for

for iustification: Therefore their opinion is hereticall, more impious then the Pelagian and Popish Heresies concerning iustification.

Secondly, that which was imputed to Abraham, and is imputed to true beleivers, is righteousness, so the Apostle affirmes, ver. 6. and 11. But faith is not righteousness taken in a proper sense, for righteousness is a perfect conformity to the Law, as sinne is transgression of the Law: Therefore faith in a proper sense is not righteousness.

Thirdly, that which chargeth God with error, and falsehood, in his iudgement, is blasphemy.

This opinion, that God countes faith for righteousness, that is, thinketh, iudgeth, and esteemeth it to be righteousness taken in a proper sense, chargeth God with error and falsehood, in his Iudgement; Therefore it is blasphemy.

If they pleade, that God by his soveraigne power, may graciously count that which is not righteousness, for righteousness to the beleever: I answer, that God by his soveraigne power, cannot ly, nor erre, nor Iudge unrighteously, it is contrary to his infinite and eternal Iustice, which wil not be satisfied without fulfilling of his iust Law, and perfect righteousness communicated, and imputed to us: Therefore this is a base shift, and wicked pretence, devised to cover their blasphemy, by that which is indeed, a greater blasphemy.

Fourthly that opinion which denyeth, and taketh away the meanes by which God is revealed to be infinitely Iust, mercifull, and wise, and makes the satisfaction of Christ and his perfect fulfilling of the Law, a vaine and needlesse thing, is most Hereticall, impious, and blasphemous.

This opinion, that God by his soveraigne power can, and doth count, and accept, faith in a proper sense for righteousness to Iustification, without imputation of Christs satisfaction, and righteousness, takes away these meanes, and makes Christs fulfilling of the Law, a vaine and need-

lesse thing. Therefore it is an *impious hereticall* and *blasphemous* opinion. The meanes by which God is revealed to be *infinitely Just, mercifull and wise*, are these: Namely, First, that he cannot be reconciled to man without a full *satisfaction* made to his *just Law* by mens *surety* in their stead, and by him *communicated* to them, and made theirs as truly as if they had *fulfilled* the Law in their owne persons, and though the *satisfaction* be of *infinite value*, yet it cannot profit them till they have *communion* of it, and be *partakers* thereof: this is that which reveales God to be *infinitely Just*, and that his *infinite justice* being so *strict*, he would *mercifully* give his owne Son to become *man*, and in *mans nature*, to make such a full *satisfaction* for *men*, and by his *Spirit* shed on them through *Christ*, would *unite* them unto him in one *body*, and *communicate* him with all his *benefits* and *satisfaction* to them, to be truly *theirs*, and to *satisfy* for *them*. This reveales his *infinite mercy, bounty, and wisdom*: And by these meanes, this opinion takes away *Gods justice*, while it sets God forth to be such a one as can dispence with is *justice* and accept *faith* in a proper sense for *righteousnes* which is no *righteousnes*, but onely a weak imperfect *worke* and *duty* which we owe to the Law. If Gods *justice* may thus be dispensed with, and a weak thing in fraile man, counted for *righteousnes* without any *communion*, or *imputation*. What need was there of *Christs Death, suffering, and obedience*; God might as well have accepted the sacrifice of a *Lamb*, or the suffering and *obedience* of a meere man, and so the full *satisfaction* of *Christ* is vaine and *needlesse*, and it was want of *wisdom* in God to spend so much of *Christs blood* and *obedience* in vaine, when by his *soveraigne power* he might have accounted a lesse thing for *mans ransome*. Therefore this opinion is *blasphemy*.

Fifthly, that opinion which overthrowes the *sacraments* of the Gospel, and the true use of them, is *hereticall* and *blasphemous*.

This

This opinion, that *Christs righteousness and obedience* is not *imputed* to the *faithfull* doth so; for the *Sacraments* are *seales* of our *communion* with *Christ*, and the *Lords Supper* rightly received, is called, the *communion* of the *faithfull*; and when these hereticks deny, that the *righteousnes of Christ* is *imputed* to the *faithfull*, they deny their *communion* with *Christ*, for if *Christs righteousness* be *communicated* *spiritually* to them, and made theirs, *God*, whose *judgement* is according to *truth*, cannot but *impute* it to them, and set it on their *score*, and count it theirs in his *true Iudgment*: If he should not count it theirs, and *impute* it to them, he should judge unjustly, and erre in his *Iudgement*; and the *Sacraments* which are *Seales* of *communion*, are lying *Seales*, if it be not *communicated* nor *imputed*. Therefore this opinion is *hereticall* and *blasphemous*.

Sixthly, that opinion which is *invented* and *maintained* by Hereticks, who deny the *eternall God-head* of *Christ*, and tends to perswade men, that there is no use of *Christs* being *God* and *man* in one *person*, is *Hereticall*, and *blasphemous*. This opinion is such, and tends to take away the use of *Christs* being *God* and *man* in one *person*, and to perswade men there is no use of his *being God* and *man* in one *person*; for all Orthodox Divines teach that it was necessary *Christ* should be *God*, that the *obedience* and *suffering* of his *man-hood* for a time might be the *suffering* and *obedience* of *God*, and so of infinite value, and of more worth then if the *elect* had suffered for ever in *Hell* in their owne *persons*, and that the *fulfilling* and *obedience* of *him* alone in our nature, should be of more value then if they all in their owne *persons* had *suffered* and *obeyed* as much as he did; They also teach, that the *satisfaction* and *righteousnes* which *Gods* infinite *justice* required, and without which it could not be *satisfied*, for the removing of so great an evil as *Gods* infinite *wrath* and *eternall death* and *torment* in *Hell*, and for the bringing in of *eternall righteousness* & making men worthy

of, and fit for *eternall glory in Heaven*, which is an *infinite good*, could not be performed by any but by *him*, who is *God and man in one person*: And therefore the *infinite evil* which was to be taken away by *Christs suffering*, and the *infinite good* which was to be procured by his *obedience, and righteousness*, required necessarily, that he should be *God and man in one person*. But the authors of this opinion, by denying that *Gods infinite justice* stands in *strength* and requires such a *satisfaction*, or that every *believer* hath need to have such a *satisfaction communicated* to him, made his by *spirituall union*, and *imputed* to him, they take away the use of *Christs God-head*, and the *causes and reasons* for which it was necessary that he should be *God*, and in conclusion they deny *Christ to be God*. Therefore this opinion is *Hereticall and Blasphemous*.

Lastly, that opinion which is builded on *Hereticall and blasphemous grounds*, and is maintained and upheld by *blasphemous Arguments*, which shake and raze the maine foundations of true Religion, is most *Hereticall and blasphemous*: And such is this opinion; for it is builded upon this *blasphemous ground*, That *God by his Sovereigne power, may do and will, things contrary to his Justice*; that is, *cannot, and accept that for righteousness*, which is not *righteousnes*, nor worthy to be counted one Act of *perfect righteousness*, (for such is the faith of fraile man taken in a proper sense) The arguments by which it is commonly maintained, are also *blasphemous*, viz. That *Christs righteousness is not the righteousness of true believers, neither is imputed to them by God for Iustification*: for they say, *God cannot Iustify one by the righteousness of another*, and therefore he cannot *Iustify us*, by *Christs righteousness*. What is this but an expresse denyall of the *union of the faithfull with Christ*, for if he be one with us, and we with him, then are *our sinnes made his*, and in him *satisfied*, and *his righteousness made ours*, and we are *Iustified by it*, as it is ours, and not the *righteousnes*

ousnes of another, nor so different from us; but that he and all his benefits are ours, and we have interest in them, and enjoy and possesse them so far as every one hath need of them.

Secondly, they argue, that the righteousness of one cannot be sufficient for all the elect, nor counted to them all for righteousness, which is in effect a denying of Christ to be God and man in one person, for if they acknowledg him to be God, they must needs acknowledge, that his righteousness and fulfilling of the Law, is of more worth and value, then if all men in the world had fulfilled the Law in their owne persons, without sayling in one point.

Thirdly, they argue, that if Christs satisfaction and righteousness be so made ours, and imputed to us, that the Law may be said to be fulfilled in us, and we may be said to have satisfied Gods Justice in and by him our surety, and our head, then is there no place left for pardon and free forgiveness of our sinnes, for pardon and satisfaction are contrary. By which they overthrow the Doctrine of redemption, and of Christs satisfaction, and deny Christ to be our redeemer, and to have payd our ransom, and made a full satisfaction for our sinnes to Gods Justice contrary to the Scriptures, and the Iudgement and beleefe of all Christian Divines, which teach, that Christ hath payd our ransom, and made a full satisfaction, and so is properly our redeemer: and though Gods Justice exacted of Christ our surety, a full ransom, and did not abate to him the least farthing of our debt, yet we are freely pardoned, and have free forgiveness, and are freely justified by Gods grace, because he did freely give Christ to satisfy and fulfill the Law for us, and doth freely by his grace, and by the free gift of his Spirit, unite us to Christ, and make us partakers of his satisfaction, and imputing his satisfaction freely to us, doth for it freely forgive our sinnes, and justify us.

Fourthly, while they argue, that faith in a proper sense is all the righteousness which the faithful have for justification

eration, and yet dare not affirme that *faith* is any *formall righteousness*, but deny that any *formall righteousness* is required in *iustification*: Hereby they deny the Saints *iustified* to be *righteous*, contrary to the *Scriptures*, which call the *faithfull iustified*, the *righteous*, and the generation of the *righteous*, which they cannot be without a *formall righteousness*, which doth *constitute* and give being to a *righteous* and *iustified* man, as he is *righteous* and *Iustified*; wherefore this is a monstrous opinion, contrary to common sense and reason.

Fifthly, while they deny, that the *faithfull* are *constituted* and made *formally righteous*, by the *obedience* of *Christ* *communicated*, and *imputed* to them, (which the *Apostle* in expresse wordes doth affirme. *Rom.* 5. 19. and 8. 4. and 10. 4.) they fall into the heresie of the *Pelagians*, and are forced to deny that *Adams sinne*, and *disobedience* is *communicated*, and *imputed* to his *posterity*, and they are *formally sinners*, by it; And rather then they will yeeld, that *Infants* which die before they commit *actuell transgression* in their owne persons are by *death* punished, because they are *guilty* of *Adams sinne*, they do *blasphemously* affirme, that *God* being *offended*, and moved to *wrath* by the *sinnes* of *Parents*, will out of the magnificence of his *Iustice*, destroy *Innocent Babes*, with their *sinfull Parents*, which is contrary to *Gods* word and *Law*, teaching us, that *Children* shall not die for the sins of their *Parents*, unlesse they be partakers with them, either by *communion* and *imputation*, or by *imitation* and *approbation*; whereas they bring for instance, that the *Children* of *Korah* were destroyed with their *Father*, though they were *Innocent*, and not partakers in the *sinne*; herein they contradict the *Scriptures*, which expressly affirme, that the *Children* of *Korah* dyed not. *Num.* 26. 11. for they upon *Moses* his *threatning*, escaped, and fled from their *Fathers Tents* in all *likely-hood*, and onely they perished, who would not be admonished by *Moses*, to separate from the *Congregation* of *Korah*,
but

but adher'd to him, & wer partakers of his *conspiracy & sin*.

Sixty, when they for a colour of their *heresie* confesse in word, that *Christs righteousness is the meritorious cause of justification*, and yet deny *communion*, and *imputation* of it to *beleevers*; they fall into this horrible opinion; That *Christ by his righteousness, doth iustifie Infidels, and impenitent Reprobates, as much as he iustifies the elect, and faithfull*: For if it be not *communicated* and *imputed* to *beleevers* in their *iustification*, then have they no more *interest* in the *merit* thereof, then *Infidels*, and *dammned Reprobates*; it is onely *meritorious*, and of *worth, value*, and *sufficiency*, to *iustifie* them, s it is to all mankind, even to *Infidels*; and what *benefit*, a and *merit* of it they have, it is by their owne *free will* making use of it, which *Infidels* might do if they would, for they have the *merit* of it as much as *beleevers*, can have without *communion*, and *imputation* of it.

Lastly, while they argue, that *as in the first covenant, God required workes of the Law performed by every man in his owne person*, and this was the *condition* which man was to performe for obtaining of *life*, and that *covenant of life* was not *free*, but *conditionall*; so in the new *covenant*, God requires in us *faith* and *beleeving*, as the *condition* which we on our part must performe for *Iustification*, and so for the obtaining of *eternall life* and *salvation*. Hereby they affirme the *new covenant*, to be a *covenant conditionall*, and not of *free grace*, for whatsoever is *covenanted* and *promised* upon a *condition* to be performed, is not *absolutely free*, nor *freely given*, and so the *faithfull* are not *iustified freely by grace*: whereas they plead, that *iustification* and *life* is promised upon *condition* of *beleeving*. (*If you beleeve you shall be saved*) This is a grosse and absurd mistake, for every *conditionall proposition* doth not propound the *condition* of a *covenant*, for that whensoever it is performed, makes the thing *covenanted* a *due debt*, which the *promiser* is bound to *give*: But oftentimes a *conditionall proposition* propounds the *meanes* by which

a free gift is received, or the qualification by which one is made capable and fit to receive and enjoy a free gift : As for example, it is often said in Scripture, *If yee will heare, and hearken, ye shall be saved, and not destroyed, your Soule shall live, and yee shall eat the good of the Land.* Isay 1. 19. Jer. 26. 3. and 36. and many other places. *If we love one another, God dwelleth in us.* Ioh. 4. 12. *If we walke in the light, we have fellowship one with another.* 1 Ioh. 1. 7. *If we confesse our sinnes, he is faithfull and iust to forgive.* 1 Ioh. 1. 9. *If a man be iust, and do that which is right, he shall surely live.* Ezek. 18. 5. 21. in all which and the like places, there is no condition of the covenant propounded, but onely the meanes and the way to receive blessing or the quality and condition by which men are made capable and fit to enjoy blessing; and sometimes the effects, and frutes of them that are in a blessed estate; and even so, when the Scripture saith, *If yee beleewe, yee shall be iustified*: there is noe condition of the covenant propounded to be performed on our part for iustification, and salvation, but onely the qualification by which God doth qualify us, and fit us by his free grace to be iustified, and saved, and the meanes by which he enables us to receive righteousness, and to lay hold on salvation, which is freely given to us in Christ.

Vpon these particulars severally observed out of their owne wordes and writings, I strongly conclude, that this opinion being builded upon such blasphemous and hereticall groundes, and maintained and upheld by such blasphemous arguments, must needs be most impious, hereticall and blasphemous.

Having already proved the Socinian, and Arminian opinion to be most false, impious, and hereticall, and blasphemous, I proceed to discover the weakenesse and absurdity of Mr. Goodwins Arguments, contained in the 2 Chapter of his Socinian discourse, which he hath attempted to publish in Print (as I heare.) which arguments

ments I am challenged to answer, and for that purpose he hath with his owne hand delivered them to me: Against which I cheerefullie set my selfe, and stand for the truth.

The maine ground upon which he pretends to build his *Arguments*, by which he labours to prove *imputation of faith* in a proper sense, for *righteousnesse*, and that *faith*, and not the *righteousnesse of Christ* apprehended by *faith* is counted for *righteousnes*, is the 4th. Chap: of the *Epistle to the Romans*.

Before his disputation he professeth, that none by any wit or learning under Heaven, is so fit to determinate what is *imputed for righteousness in justification* as the *holy Ghost* speaking in the *Scriptures*; and yet he saith, he leaves his meaning and intent in many things, unto men to debate, which they onely can declare to whom he reveales the secret of his counsell, and amongst these being the true begotten of the truth: he seemes to intimate, that he will prove himselfe to be one, by some *Stamp or superscription of a rationall authority*, set upon him, though in common esteeme he be but like other men, and the neerer he is to the truth, the farther off he is from the approbation of many men, greatest pretenders to the truth.

Though the rude multitude of his Disciples give just offence, by proclayming him to be the great *light of Gods Church*, revealed in these last times; yet in him it is more scandalous and offensive, that he, professing the *holy Ghost* to be the best iudge for determining controversies, doth immediately contradict himselfe, by saying, that he leaves his meaning and intent, to be debated by men, and makes such men as himselfe (stamped with a *rationall Authority*) the judges of his meaning: What is this, but the heresie of the *Arminians*, who hold, that their right reason, (as they call it) and not the word of the Spirit speaking plainly in the *Scriptures*, is the best Iudge of the Spirits meaning and intent in obscure places, and how

scandalous, and offensive it is for him to profes *such excellent things* of himselfe before hand, and in the whole *progresse* of his *disputation* to run so far from the *Spirits meaning*, and from all *right reason* (as I shall prove by my sitting, and answering of his *Arguments*) I leave to the *Godly wise, and learned* to Judge.

His first Argument.

Argu. **F**irst, he undertakes to prove, That *faith in a proper sense* is affirmed by the *Apostle* to be imputed for *righteousnes*, and not the *righteousnesse* of *Christ* apprehended by *faith*, Because the phrase of *imputing faith* for *righteousnes* is once, yea twice, yea a third, and fourth time used by the *Apostle* in this Chapter, and therefore hath all the *Authority* and countenance from the *Scriptures* that wordes can give, whereas the *imputation* of *Christs righteousness* hath not the least relieve either from any sound of wordes, or sight of letter in the *Scriptures*.

Answer.

Ans. **I**N this *Argument* he shewes himselfe as *bould* in affirming manifest *untruthes*, as ignorant both of *Rhetorick* and *Logick*: In *Rhetorick* it is counted an excellent ornament of speech to continue a *trope*, and it is called an *Allegory*, (he is ignorant who knoweth not this.) In *Logick* he is counted a *bold lying Sophister*, who holds that a *Syllogisme*, a true and perfect *Argument* hath a *proposition* which is manifestly false. And what more grosse ignorance in *Logick*, then to hold two *propositions* to be *negative* and *affirmative*, in respect of one another, which consist of divers subjects, and that an *affirmative* and the *negative* may both be true. All these absurdities appeare in this *Argument*.

First, in that he affirms the *Apostles* speech to be proper, and the sense to be properly *literall*, because he useth

useth the same phrase foure times : hereby he shewes his *Ignorance* of the continuance of a *trope*, which *Rhetoricians* esteeme an elegant *Allegory*, and which is most frequent in the *Scripture* : For *Jer. 26.* the *Lord* is said to *repent* 3 severall times, *viz. ver. 3. 13. 19.* and yet the speech is not proper, but improper; for *God* cannot properly be said to *repent*, as appeares *Num. 23. 19. 1 Sam. 15. 29.* Here then he sheweth as much *Ignorance* of *Rhetoricke*, and of the frequent use of rhetorical *Allegories* in the *Scripture*, as he seemes to shew of *Logick*, when he makes his *affirmative*, *viz. Faith is imputed for righteousness*; and affirms it to be true, and withall saith, that the *negative* inseparably accompanying it, is a *truth* also, when *Logick* teacheth, that if the *affirmative* be true, the *negative* must needs be false. If by the *negative* he meanes this, *viz. Christs righteousness is not imputed*: He erres two waies from *Logick*, first by calling the *negative* inseparably accompanying his *affirmative* : Secondly, by speaking ambiguously, a speech which may beare divers senses; which *Logick* abhorres in a *disputation*. Secondly, he shewes himselfe a bould lving *Sophister*, when he affirms most *falsely*, and *impudently*, That no *truth* in Religion, nor article of our *faith*, can boast of the *Letter*, that is, of the proper *literall sense* of the *Scripture* more full, expresse, and pregnant, then that speech or *proposition* which is foure times used in one Chapter, For the contrary is most manifestly true, as divers places shew, where one and the same thing is often *affirmed*, and yet the speech is not proper, but *tropicall*: I will instance in one place which is most convincing, *viz. Gal. 3.* where the word (*Faith*) is ten times used in an improper sense, for the word of *faith* the Gospel, as it is opposed to the Law carnallie understood, *viz. verse 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 12, 14, 22, 23, 25.* Now the maine *proposition* of his Syllogisme being so manifestly false, his conclusion inferred from thence is certainly most false, *viz. that this speech of Saint Paul (Faith is counted for righteousness)*

is properly *literall*. and not improper and *tropicall*.

2. Arg.

The second Argument couched under the other runs thus, if it be reduced into a *Syllogisme*. That which hath not the least releife either from any sound of wordes, or sight of letter in the *Scripture*, is an untruth and a meere *fiction*, the *imputation* of *Christs righteousness* hath not the least releife, either from sound of wordes, or sight of letter in *Scripture*. Therefore it is a meere *fiction*.

Ans.

The *Assumption* or *Minor* of this *Syllogisme* is most false, and therefore the conclusion hath no truth in it: I prove it most false by the *Apostles* owne wordes; for in the fourth v. he saith, *that to the blessed man God imputeth righteousness without workes*; and verse 11. where he saith, that as to *Abraham* faith was imputed before hee was circumcised, so God shewed, that *righteousnes* should be imputed to the *beleeving Gentiles* though *uncircumcised*, In which two places he shewes, that by *beleeving* and *faith* imputed to *Abraham* and all true *beleevers*, the Spirit of God meanes *righteousnes* couched under the name of *faith*, and *beleeving*. Now this *righteousnes* cannot be *faith* it selfe in a proper sense; for every act of *faith* is a *worke*; but this is a *righteousnes* imputed to us without *workes* done by us in our owne persons, besides *faith* and all the *beleeving* of the most *faithfull* cannot make up one *duty*, or *worke* of true and perfect *righteousnes*, such as God can impute to *justification*, for *faith* in the best *beleevers* (even in *Abraham* himselfe) was stayned with many doubtings & fears. But here must needes be meant that *righteousnes* in which the most just God can see no imperfection, and therefore counts it for *righteousnes* to *justifie* all that are partakers of it; And this can be no other but the *righteousnes* which *Christ* God and man performed in mans nature, therefore the contrary of the *Assumption* is most true.

3. Arg.

The third, which hee calls his second mayne Argument or prooffe, is drawne from the scope of the place, and the intent of the *Apostle* in his discourse of justification, here in these

these Chapters of this Epistle, it runs thus being reduced into a Syllogisme. The scope of the place, and intent of the Apostle, is to hedge up as it were with thornes the false way of justification which lay through workes, and to put men by from attempting any going that way; and also to discover the true way of justification to them; that is; to make knowne unto them; what they must doe, and what God requires of them for justification, and what hee will accept at their hands, instead of the workes of the Law, and that is it which he heere saith, is imputed for righteousness. Now faith and beleiving in the proper and formall signification is that which they must doe and performe to their justification, which also God requires of them instead of the workes of the Law, and will accept at their hands instead of them. Therefore it is faith in a proper sense which is here by the Apostle to be counted for righteousness.

In the first proposition we have an heape of lyes mixt with contradiction, first, in that he saith, the scope of the Apostle is to put men from the false way of justification which lies through workes, and to discover the true way by making them know what they must doe, and performe for justification; here like a mad or drunken man he contradicts himselfe, for, who doth not see that the way of doing and performing is the way which lyes through workes, and that if a thing done and performed by us be counted for righteousness to justification, then the way of justification lies through workes done by us: which if they be iust and lawfull, are workes of the Law. Secondly, if he by the way which lay through workes understands mens owne workes done in obedience to the Law of God; it is true which he saith; that this is the false way; and that which hee calls the true way; viz. by mens doing and performing, is either the same with it, or else worse; and so hee speaks a most grosse untruth, in calling it the true way, being the same with the false way; but if by the way which lies through workes

Ans.]

workes he meanes seeking after *Christs righteousness* which consisteth in *workes* of obedience to the *Law*, then his wordes are most false, wicked and blasphemous, in that he calls this the false way to *justification*.

Thirdly, in that he saith, *God* requires something to be don, and performed by men for their *justification*, and that is it, which the *Apostle* saith is *imputed* for *righteousnes*, this is most false, neither doth the *Apostle* intend any such thing in this place, for this is to set up *justification* by doing, and *workes* of our owne, which he altogether opposeth, and his whole scope is bent against it, and to shew, that all which we are to looke to, is to receive that which is freely given of *God*, and *imputed* to us for *righteousnes*, that is, the *righteousnes* of him who is *God*; as he often calls it in this *Epistle*, as *Rom. 3. 2.* and *10. 3.* here then behold how hee makes the new *covenant* a conditionall *Covenant*, and not of free *grace*; promising *justification* and *salvation* upon condition of mens doing.

In brieft, besides the contradictions and other absurdities and untruthes in this *Argument* before noted, I finde these grosse errors in the carriage of it, One is; in that he saith, *God* doth not require of us the *righteousnes* of *Christ* for *justification*, this hee required of *Christ* himselfe.

To which I answer; that *God* requires nothing of us for our *justification*, for wee are *justified* freely by his *grace* through the redemption that is in *Iesus Christ* *Rom. 3. 24.* that is, by the free gift and communion of the *satisfaction* which *Christ* made for our *redemption*; but yet the thing which *God* requires in our behalfe, is that *satisfaction* and *righteousnes* of *Christ*, and the qualification of us for the receiving, applying and enjoying of that *righteousnes* for *justification*, is *faith*, which is not of our selves, but is the gift of *God*, *Ephes. 2. 8.* for *God* worketh in us the will and power to beleeve, and actually beleeving also, *Phil. 2. 13.* and all this by his *spirit* dwelling

dwelling in us uniting us to *Christ*, and so bringing us to communion of all his benefits, even of his *righteousnes* to *iustification*: and this is the true intent and scope of the *Apostle*, to draw us from seeking *iustification* by any *worke*, which we can doe, or which *God* requires of us for that end, and to make us looke up to the *redemption* which is in *Christ*; and in his satisfaction apprehended by *faith* to rest for *iustification*: as for this phrase, of *Gods* requiring *Christs righteousness* of us, it is harsh and unfavoury, yea absurd; as if one should say *God* requires, that the particular and individual act done by another, bee not done by him, but by us; which implies a contradiction; but this, that *God* requires the *righteousnes* of *Christ*, not for our justification, but of *Christ* himselfe; this implies; that *Christ* had need of *iustification*, and was bound to fulfill the *righteousnes* of the *Law* for himselfe; and favours of *Socinian* and *Samosatenian* Heresie which denies *Christs God-head*; for if *Christs* humane nature being from the first conception most pure, upright and holy, was personally united to his *God-head*, and so the Sonne of *God* and *Heire* of all things; who can doubt but that in himselfe he was worthy of all Glory, at *Gods* right hand from his birth, as his taking of our nature upon him was altogether for us, so his infirmities, sufferings, death, and continuance on Earth for the performance of all *righteousnesse* and *obedience* to the whole *Law*, was for us, and for all the Elect, who of old beleevved in him to come for them, and who now doe in beleevve him exalted to Glory according to his humanity, to thinke or say that he had need to justifie himselfe, and to merit by his *righteousnes* the state of Glory, is in effect to deny that he was *God* infinitely worthy of all Glory, as he was the onely begotten Sonne of *God* and *Heire* of all things. Another grosse error is, that he calls *faith* and *beleeving* a thing don and performed by us, when as the *Apostle* affirms, and all Christians confesse, that our

believing and *faith* is not of our selves, but the gift of God, and the worke and motion of his Spirit in us.

A third untruth and grosse absurdity or rather blasphemy is in the last wordes, where he affirmes, that if the *Apostle* had said unto them, that they must bee justified by *Christ*, or by *Christs righteousness*, this had beene rather to cast a snare upon them, then to have opened a dore of life and *salvation* unto them. Farre bee it from mee and all true Christians not to detest and curse with the curse of *Anathema Maranatha*, that mouth which proclaimes and obstinately maineines, that teaching *iustification* by *Christ*, and by his *righteousnes* is casting of a snare on men, and not opening a dore of *life* and *salvation* to them.

In the third place he layes down his *arguments* against the true *Orthodox* interpretation of *Saint Pauls* speeches, concerning imputation of *faith* for *righteousnes*, which interpretation he goeth about to overthrow, by severall circumstances or passages in the context.

1. Arg.

The first Argument reduced into forme runs thus, that the *Apostle* who desired to speake to mens understanding, should in the weighty point of *iustification*, time after time, and often without ever explaining himselfe, or changing his speech, use so strange harsh and uncouth an expression, and figure of speech as is not to be found in all his writings, is a thing most unlikely and not to be beleevd: But this interpretation viz. Fathers upon him such an harsh expression, and figure of speech, without ever explaining of himselfe, as is not to be found in all his writings, saying, that *faith* or *believing* is imputed for *righteousnes* time after time, without ever changing his speech, and meaning, that indeed *Christs righteousness* is imputed, which was to speake rather that he might conceale his mind then reveale it. Therefore this interpretation layeth on the *Apostle* a thing incredible, and is false and not to be beleevd.

To the *Assumption* I answer, that it is an heape of *Ans.*
 manifest and impudent lies. First, it is no harsh, strange,
 and uncouth expression to use a *figure* of speech, and by
faith and *beleeving* to meane the state, or a man in the
 state of a true faithfull *beleever*, and by *righteousnes*,
 the state, or a man in the state of *righteousnes*, or of a
 righteous man, and to say that *faith* and *beleeving* is
 counted for *righteousnes*, meaning that the state of a
beleever having by *faith* spirituall communion with
Christ, is a state of *righteousnes*, and the man which
 is in that estate, is *reputed* of *God* in the state of *right-*
eousnes, for this same expression and *figure* of speech,
 the *Apostle* useth severall times in the toure last *verses*
 of the 2. *Chapter* of this *Epistle*; where by *circumcision*
 he understands *sanctification* of the heart in the *Spirit*,
verse 29. and also 26. and also a circumcised *Jew*, v.
 27. and by *uncircumcision* he meanes an uncircumcised
Gentile, and also the state of *Gentilisme*, as *Beza* ob-
 serves, and common sense teacheth; and here is disco-
 vered a second impudent lye, in that he saith, this *fi-*
gure of speech is not to bee found in all the *Apostles*
 writings. A third bold lye and manifest falshood is,
 that the *Apostle* time after time useth the *phrase* of *faith*,
 or *beleeving* *imputed* without ever explaining himselfe,
 or changing his speech, for that which hee calls *faith*
 and *beleeving*, and saith it is *imputed* in the third and 5.
ver. he explaining himselfe, and changing his speech both
 in the 6. and 11. *verses*, calls it *righteousnes*, and saith,
God imputeth righteousness, and *righteousnes* is *imputed*.

Thus you see how hee hath bent his tongue and pen
 like a bow for lyes, and shootes them forth thick and
 threefold like poysoned *arrowes*, as if his *quiver* were
 the armory of the *Father* of lyers, the *Prince* of dark-
 nesse.

The second Argument is briefly this, that which is im- 2. Arg.
 puted for *righteousnes*, is called his *faith*, first before it is
 imputed.

imputed, verse 5. to him that beleeueth his faith is counted for righteousness; But the righteousness of Christ cannot truly and properly be called his; who is a true believer before it is imputed. Therefore the righteousness of Christ is not here to be understood under the name of faith.

1. *Ans.*

The righteousness of Christ by spirituall union and common with Christ: is as truly the true believers as his faith is his, for Christ is made unto him righteousness, 1 Cor. 1. 30. and he is made the righteousness of God in Christ, 2 Cor. 5. 21. and that in order of nature, before it is counted his righteousness. For God, whose judgement is according to truth, doth not count that to the believer which he hath not before, or at the same time doth communicate to him.

2. *Ans.*

Secondly I answer, that if faith which is here called (his faith) be faith in a proper sense, and bee imputed for righteousness, then is man justified by his owne inherent righteousness, and by a worke done and performed in his owne person, which is worse then Popery.

3. *Ans.*

The object of that faith which is here said to be imputed, is God himselfe, or the promise of God, and not the righteousness of Christ: for to understand, that the righteousness of Christ is meant by God, is to set up a trope, which is not a figure of speech, but a monster of speech. Therefore Christs righteousness is not here said to be imputed.

Ans.

The object of Abrahams faith was the promise of Christ, and that in Christ God was his shield and his great reward, Gen. 15. 1. Now no man can in believing by true faith, separate Christs satisfaction and righteousness from Christ himselfe: if he enjoy Christ by faith, he enjoyes Christs benefits also; and to beleeve God to be our reward, is to beleeve that God is become our righteousness, and so our reward, for the blessed reward is the reward of righteousness; and therefore this argument

ment rightly framed out of the 3. v. from *Abrahams beleeving God*, is strong against him; Here againe I note his ignorance in Rhetoricall tropes, in that hee saith, a double trope in one word, is a monster of speech; whereas Rhetorick calls it a *Metalepsis*, and counts it an ornament of speech. I here also observe his vaine tergiversation; for hee saith, that the Holy Ghost in the rehearfall of the things which belong to the object of faith and which are beleeved, doth never make the least mention of *Christs righteousness*; and immediately reckons many things which we are in *Scripture* required to beleeve; amongst which is *Christ* himselfe, and the doctrine of *Christ*, and the promise of *Christ*, the testimony which *God* hath given of his Sonne, and the resurrection of *Christ*, every one of which includes *Christs righteousness*; for if we beleeve in *Christ* aright, we cannot but beleeve in him as a fulfiller of all righteousness; the Doctrine concerning *Christ* is, that he is made untous of *God* righteousness; that hee is the end of the Law for righteousness to every beleever; The promise of *Christ* of old was, that *Christ* is the Lord our righteousness, *Ier. 23. 6.* and that he would cloath us with the Robe of righteousness, *Isay 61. 10.* the Testimony which *God* hath given of him is, that in him wee have eternall life, *1 Iohn 5. 11.* which is the reward of his righteousness, and therefore righteousness in him: His resurrection is the evidence of his righteousness and perfect satisfaction, as the *Scriptures* testifie. And thus hee saith one thing, and after brings many *Scriptures* to confute himselfe; and at last grants what before hee denied; that *Christs righteousness* is to bee beleeved: Hee saith that some beleeve *Christs righteousness* who beleeve not *Christ* himselfe, which is indeed a Monster of Speech, Sense, and Reason. In a word, when the Spirit of *God* teacheth to beleeve the righteousness of *God* for Iustification,

Romans 10. 3. and in many other places, which can be no other but *Christs* perfect *righteousnes*, and *satisfaction*, as appeares *Rom. 3. 24.* and againe, calls this *righteousnes*, the *righteousnes* of *faith*, he plainly shewes, that it is *beleeved*, *applied*, *enjoyed*, and *possessed* by *faith*.

- 4 *Arg.* *Christs* *righteousnes* can in no tollerable sense be called that *faith* whereby *Abraham* beleeved in *God*, that quickned the dead. Therefore under the name of that *faith*, it is not sayd to be imputed for *righteousnes*.

Ans. *God* neither quickned *Christ*, nor raised him till he had fulfilled all *righteousnes*, neither doth he quicken any dead, but through his *righteousnes*, and by his *Spirit*, communicating it to them: and therefore under the name of such a *faith*, *Christs* *righteousnes* is by a *Metonymie* said to be imputed.

- 5 *Arg.* *Abrahams* *faith* was that wherein he was not weake, neither doubted of *Gods* promise, ver. 19. 20. but *Christs* *righteousnesse* is not that *faith*, Therefore it is not here sayd to be imputed.

Ans. The more strong that *Abraham* was in *faith*, and far from doubting and staggering by unbelieve, the more firmly was he united to *Christ*, and had more full communion of his *righteousnes*, and the more stedfastly did he stand in the state of a *righteous man*: and more justly might *God* count him for a *righteous man*. And therefore this *Argument* makes against him.

- 6 *Arg.* *Abrahams* beleeving that *God* who had promised was able to performe, was the *faith* imputed. But this was not *Christs* *righteousnesse*. Therefore *Christs* *righteousnes* was not imputed.

Ans. The more that *Abraham* rested on *Gods* power and ability to performe, the more communion he had of *Christs* *right-*

righteousnes, and the more justly did God count him for a righteous man, and impute Christs righteousnes to him.

The faith which God imputes to us for righteousnes, is 7 Arg. our beleeving him which raised Christ from the dead. But this is not Christs righteousnes. Therefore it is not imputed.

Our beleeving in God who raised Christ from the dead, is our assurance that Christ had made full satisfaction for us, and therefore the righteous God who raised him up is satisfied for us, and hath accepted his righteousnes to be our righteousnes, and doth count us so beleeving, and applying it to be in the state of righteousnes. Therefore this is for us and not against us. Ans.

The 8th. Argument is a bare affirmation, that to take 8 Arg. faith in a proper sense, is more plaine and cleare, and better beleeving the Apostle in this discourse, where he largely handles the point of justification: Therefore he here meanes faith in a proper sense, for that is more comfortable then to teach imputation of Christs righteousnes.

The Apostle plainly expresseth, that faith imputed, is righteousnes imputed. verse 6. 11. and it is more comfortable for us to rest on Christs righteousnes, (besides which, there is no true and perfect righteousnes to be found performed in our nature) then to build on faith, which in the best is mingled and stayned with many doubtings often times. Therefore the Apostle undoubtedly intends Christs righteousnes, and so he doth expresse in plaine wordes, Chap. 5. 19. Chap. 8. 4. and Chap. 10. 4.

After these Arguments, he takes upon him to answer Arg. those places wherein the word faith and hope, are used to signifie their objects, that is, the things beleeved and hoped for, and here he doth use notable reversion, and trifling.

trifling. First, he grants, that the Apostle useth such *tropes of speech*, for indeed, it is undeniable. Secondly, he opposeth and saith, that the *habit of faith*, may be used to signifie the *object*, but not the *act*, whereas in the *examples named*, Gal. 1. 22. and 3. 23. and Colo. 1. 5. the *habit* and *act*, espelcially the *act* of *beleefe* and *hope* are to be understood, and indeed the Apostle doth name the *habit* as often as the *act* in this present *discourse*, where he saith, *faith is imputed for righteousness*.

Thirdly, he grants that the *act* sometimes may be put for the *object*, but then he flees to his *old shift* that *Christs righteousness* is not the *object* of *beleeving*, which I have before proved it to be:

Lastly, contrary to all *reason* he denies *Christs righteousness* to be the *object* of *faith*, as it is *iustifying*, whereas it is indeed the onely *proper object* of it. Thus he shamefully trifles to shew his *impudency*, and *perversenes*.

The fourth way of Confirmation.

IN the fourth and last place, he undertakes to confirme his opinion by *testimony*, of learned Divines, both ancient Fathers and moderne Writers, even from the *primitive times*, to the yeare 1500 after *Christ*: And here he confesseth, that he dares not upon his owne *reading* be confident, that they generally were of his opinion, but onely *resteth* upon another mans *testimony*, whom he nameth not: Belike, it was some *notorious*, and *infamous Socinian Heretick*, whom he is ashamed to name for his *Author*, and that his *confession* is not out of *humility*, and *modesty*, but out of *Satanicall subtilty*, to vent his *poysenfull lies*, under the *person* of another, as the Devill did vent his by the Serpent, Gen. 3. I easily gather by his *impudent boldnesse*, in that, upon a lying report, he dares charge his *adversaries* with *calumny*, and *false report*, raised upon his opin. on (unworthy the *tongue* or *pen* of *sober* and *learned men*) to make either *Arminius*, or *Sacinus*, the *Authors*

thors of it ; and that he is not ashamed nor blushe to affirme, that from the time of *Luther*, and *Calvin*, the fairest streame of *interpreters* runs, as to water and refresh his *interpretation*.

To the first I answer, That though the anciently condemned *Heretick Peter Anilard*, (who was gelded for his *incontinency*, by a man whose *Daughter* he had abused) layd the first ground of this opinion ; that *Christs satisfaction* is not imputed for *justification*, as *Saint Bernard* shewes, *Epist.* 190. yet the first *Authors* who expressly affirmed, that *faith* in a proper sense, without a trope, is by the *Apostle* sayd to be imputed for *righteousnes*, were *Socinus*. *Part 4. Chap. 4. de Christo servatore.* and *Chap. 11.* And *Arminius* in *Epist. ad Hippolitum de collibus. Thes. 5.* And to his false pretence of the maine streame of writers, since *Calvin*, and *Luther*, running to refresh his *interpretation*, I oppose this challenge, that he cannot name one *Orthodox Writer* since that time, which ever held, that *faith* in a proper sense, is imputed for *righteousnesse*, and denyed the *imputation* of *Christs righteousness*. *Socinus*, *Arminius*, and that *hereticall sect*, are the onely maintainers of that opinion.

An Answer to all his Testimonies.

TO his *Testimonies*, and his impudent boasting, of the generall consent of *Interpreters*, I answer, first joyntly and in generall : That of all the *Testimonies* which he hath cited, there is not one which either affirms, that *faith* taken in a proper sense, is imputed for *righteousnesse*, or denyes the *righteousnesse* of *Christ*, to be imputed to us, and accepted of *God* for our *justification*; yea, that all *Divines*, who are the most zealous opposers of his *interpretation* may say the same wordes which his *Authors* say, and yet hold *justification* by *Christs righteousness*, imputed : yea, and in proving that truth may with good reason, presse the same wordes and speeches rightly understood

stood. So that a more odious *example* of *impudency* and *folly*, cannot be imagined, then he here makes *himselfe*, by making his *folly* and *absurdity* to strive for *Master-ship* with his *impudency*.

Secondly, for the particular *testimonies* which he cites out of *Tertullian*, *Origen*, *Iustin Martyr*, *Chrysostom*, *Augustine*, *Primasius*, *Beda*, *Haymo*, and *Anselme*, and out of later Writers, to wit, *Luther*, *Bucer*, *Peter Martyr*, *Calvin*, *Musculus*, *Bullinger*, *Gualter*, *Arotius*, *Ilyricus*, *Pelicanus*, *Humius*, *Beza*, *Iunius*, *Pareus*, they are no more but what *Saint Paul* saith, and we all acknowledge and imbrace for *truth*, namely, that *Abraham* beleeving *God*, was counted a *righteous man*, and *faith* was counted to him for *righteousnesse*, and so are we all *iustified*, not by our owne *righteousnesse*, and *workes* of the *Law*, performed in our owne persons, but by *faith* counted for *righteousnesse*; for *faith* insted of our owne *workes*, layes hold on the *righteousnes* of *Christ*, and apprehending, and comprehending it, is counted for *righteousnes*, not in a proper sense, but as it comprehends *Christ* and his *righteousnes*, which *Calvin* calles apprehending the *goodnes* of *God*, and trusting in it. And therefore it is truly affirmed by *Iustine Martyr*, that *Abraham* obtained the *testimony* of *righteousnes*, viz. that he was a *righteous man*, not because of his *circumcision*, but because of his *faith*; which wordes imply, That *faith* is not the *righteousnes* of the *beleever*, but the *evidence* of his *communion* with *Christ* in his *righteousnes* and *satisfaction*.

The *Testimony* which he cites out of *Musculus*, is expressly contrary to his *interpretation*; for the wordes are, *Commendata esse debebat hac fides, nō propria qualitatis, sed propositi Dei respectu*, that is, This *faith* ought to be commended, not in respect of the proper *quality* of it, that is, Not in a proper sense, but in respect of the purpose of *God*, wherby he hath appointed, that to beleeve in *Christ*, he wil impuse it for *righteousnes*; *propter ipsum*, that is because of *Christ* himselfe, in whom they beleeve: By which

which wordes it is plaine, that *faith* is not *imputed* in a proper sense to the *beleever*, but in respect of *Christ*, in whom he *beleeveth*, and whose *righteousnes* he *applies* by *faith*.

The wordes which he cites out of *Aretius*, are also strong for us, against *himselfe*, viz. That *God imputed righteousnes* to *Abraham*, that is, so accepted his *faith*, that hereupon he counted him for a *righteous man*, by *imputative righteousnes*, which *righteousnes* cannot be any thing *inherent* (as *faith* and our owne *workes* are) but the *righteousnes* of *Christ*, besides which, there is no *righteousnes* to be found in all the world perfect and fit to *justify man* before *God*.

Illyricus his wordes are as plaine against him as our hearts can wish, viz. That *begging faith* apprehending the *righteousnes* of *Christ*, is *imputed* to him in sted of his owne *righteousnes*: where note, that the reason why *God* doth *impute faith* for *righteousnes* is, because it apprehends *Christ's righteousnes*, not because it of it selfe in a proper sense is fit to be counted *righteousnes*: being but a poore begging hand, and being *inherent* in the *beleever*, which *imputative righteousnes* can in no wise be.

Thus in all his *testimonies* we have not one word to prove that *faith* taken in a proper sense is onely *imputed* for *righteousnes*, and not the *righteousnes* of *Christ*; But many *Testimonies* by him cited prove directly the contrary *interpretation*.

But because I will not have such a *forgor*, and *false suborner* of *witnesse*s goe away without the brandes of *forgery*, and *notorious impudency*; I will bring in the best learned of the *Ancients*, and also of late *Orthodox Divines*, even those whom he calls to *witnesse* for him, and make them *speake* in the r owne wordes, and testify to all the world, That by *faith imputed* for *righteousnes*, they understand not *faith* it selfe in a proper sense, but the *satisfaction*, and *righteousnes* of the *Lord Iesus Christ*, *God* and *man*, performed according to the *Law* in our nature, and in our behalfe.

First *Iustin Martyr* testifieth, that we being in our selves wicked, and ungodly, cannot possibly become righteous, or be iustified, but onely in the Sonne of God, Δικαιωθῆναι δυνατόν του ἀνόμου ἡμᾶς καὶ ἀσεβεῖς ἐν μόνῳ τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ. Now if onely in the Sonne of God, and by union, and communion with him, (which all have, who are in him) then, onely by his righteousness; (For as the same *Ambrosius* in the same place saith) It is his righteousness and nothing else which can cover our sin. *Iustin Martyr*, *Epist. ad Diognetum*. And in his exposition of faith, he saith, That Christ as well by his exact conversation of life; that is, his perfect righteousness, as by his undeserved death, hath abolished, and covered our fall and fayling, which came in by Adam.

Irenaeus is so strict for our communion with Christ, in his obedience unto death, and for our reconciliation, and justification thereby, that he imputes Christs obedience to us, and saith, *In secundo Adamo reconciliati sumus, obediētes usq; ad mortem facti. Lib. 4. adversus Hæreses. cap. 14.*

Athanasius in his 2 Tome, Pag. 270. of *Comelinus* edition saith, That it is most necessary for us to beleve Scriptures, that Christ who hath freed us from the curse, is the first fruite of the masse of mankind, who are by him redeemed, and that the perfect fulfilling of the Law by him the first fruite, is imputed to the whole masse, his wordes are in Greeke, ὡς λογίζεσθαι τῷ σὺνδάματι. And in his Booke of the Incarnation of the word of God he affirmeth, that we shall live and be saved, because we are partakers of the righteousness without spot, which Christ, God in the flesh, brought into the World.

Gregorie Nyssen; *Oration 2. in Cantic. Canticorum*, saith, Christ having the filth or guilt of my sinnes, transferred upon himselfe, hath communicated his perfect purity to me, and made me partaker of that beautie which is in himselfe.

Ambrose saith, as Adam is the paterne of death, because of sinne, So is Christ the paterne of life because of his righte-

ousnesse, *Commentar. in cap. 7, Luca Lib. 5.*

Chrysostom saith, *If a few aske thee, how can all the world be saved by the righteous doings of one Christ? Thou maist answere even so, as all the world is condemned by one Adams disobedience: cap. 5. ad Rom. Homil. 10.* That is, by the communion and imputation of them.

Cyrril saith, *Lib. 11. in Ioan. cap. 25.* Christ being the author of the Law, and yet subiecting himselfe to the Law by his obedience and righteousness, brings the blessing and life untous. And *Lib. de recta fide*, he saith, *It is absurd to thinke, that we should be made heires of the punishment of the first Adam, by his disobedience, and should not be made partakers of the righteousness of the second who doth bring us backe to life, by his most perfect obedience.*

Theodoret. *Sermo. 10. de curat. Grac. affectionum* saith. It is very convenient that he who so highly praised righteousness, should in his comming in the flesh fulfill righteousness for men.

Augustin. *Enchirid, ad Laurentium cap. 41.* saith, he was made sinne, that we might be made righteousness; not our owne, but Gods righteousness; not in our selves, but in him, even as he was sinne, not his owne sinne, but ours, not in himselfe, but in us: and in his 6. *Sermon, de verbis Apostoli*; God the Father (saith he) made him sinne, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him. Behold here two things, the righteousness of God, yet our owne; in him, not in our selves.

Leo the first: in his 70. *Epistle* saith, that by the innocency of one, we are all made innocent; and that by righteousness derived unto men from him, who hath taken mans nature upon him.

Bernard in his 190. *Epistle* saith, as one bath borne the sinnes of all, so the satisfaction of one is imputed to all; It was not one which forfeited, and another which satisfied, for the head of the body is one Christ. Also, in *Sermon. ad Milites Templi* he saith, Death is made to flee away in the Death of Christ, and Christs righteousness

ousnes is imputed to us. And a little after; he who hath willingly bin *incarnate*, willingly suffered, and beene willingly crucified, will he keepe back his *righteousnes* onely from us. And againe; *One man sinned, and all are held guilty*, and shall the *innocency* of one, viz. Christ, bee imputed only to one?

Anselme in *Rom. 5.* saith, that by the *righteousnes* of one coming upon all the *elect*, they come unto *justification*; that they may bee *justified* by participation of *Christs righteousness*.

These with many other Testimonies which might be produced out of *Ancient Writers*, from the *Primitive* times untill *Luther*, doe abundantly shew, that they all by *faith imputed*, never dreamed of *faith imputed* in a proper sense, but only the *righteousnes* of *Christ* apprehended by *faith*.

But to descend to *Orthodox Writers* of this last age since *Luther*; It is well knowne, that they generally held *imputation* of our *sinnes* to *Christ*, and *Christs satisfaction* and *righteousnes* to us, to be the forme of *justification*, by which *beleevers* are *justified*.

Luther (if wee may beleeve his owne wordes) acknowledgeth that it was the Doctrine of *Saint Bernard*, concerning *justification* by the *righteousnes* of *Christ* imputed, and not by our owne *workes*, which moved him first to loath the *popish* Doctrine, and to grow into suspicion and dislike of that *religion*. And in his *Commentary* on the *Galathians*, where he doth most highly extoll the *righteousnes* of *faith*, and debateth the *righteousnes* of *workes*, hee tels us, that *faith* being weake in many of *Gods Children*, cannot bee accepted for *righteousnes* of it selfe, that is, in a proper sense; and therefore there is necessarily required *imputation* of *righteousnes* for *justification*, in *Gal. 3. 6.*

See further in the very wordes of *Luther* gathered out of his owne writings, and digested into common places by *Fabricius*, who cites the *volume*, and *page* for every
very

very word and sentence, which are these, first concerning justifying *faith*, he saith, *faith* obtaines what the *Law* commands; and what is that but *obedience* and *righteousnes*, 1 *Tom.* pag. 32.

And againe, by *Faith* *Christ* is in us, yea one body with us. But *Christ* is righteous and a fulfiller of *Gods* Commandements; wherefore wee all by him doe fulfill them, while *Christ* is made ours by *faith*, also *Tom.* 3. page 539. when *Paul* ascribes *iustification* to *faith*, wee must of necessity understand, that hee speakes of *faith* laying hold on *Christ*, which makes *Christ* of efficacy against *Death*, sinne, and the *Law*: Also 2. *Tom.* page 515. *Faith* settles us upon the *workes* of *Christ* without our owne *workes*, and translates us out of the *exile* or captivity of our sinnes, into the Kingdome of his *righteousnes*. And *Tom.* 1. pag. 410. Sinne is not destroyed unlesse the *Law* be fulfilled.

But the *Law* is not fulfilled, but by the *righteousnesse* of *faith*: And page 437. To keepe the *Law*, is to have or possesse *Christ* the perfect fulfiller of the *Law*. And *Tom.* 4. Page 44. *Faith* *iustifies*, because it apprehendeth, and possesseth that treasure; viz. *Christ*. And Page 45. we say that *Christ* doth forme *faith*, or is the forme of *faith*. And *Tom.* 2. upon *Genesis*, The laying hold on the *promises* is called sure and firme *faith*, and doth *justifie*, not as it is our *worke*, but the *workes* of *God*. These speeches shew plainly, that *Luther* conceived *Christ* with his *righteousnesse* to bee after a sort the formall *righteousnesse* of the beleever; though not formally inherent in him, yet formally possessed and enjoyed by *faith*. Concerning this justifying *righteousnes*, *Luther* also teacheth; that it is not in our selves, but in *Christ*, even his fulfilling of the *Law* for us made ours and imputed to us *Tom.* 1. page 106. By *faith* (saith hee) are our sinnes made no more ours but *Christs*, upon whom *God* hath laid the iniquities of us all, and he hath borne our sinnes: and on the other

ther side, all his *righteousnes* is made ours, for he layes his hand upon us. And page 178. The *righteousnesse* of a Christian is anothers *righteousnes*, and comes to him from without; it is even *Christ* who is made unto us of *God* *righteousnes*, so that a man may with confidence glory in *Christ*, and say, *Christ* his living, doing, and suffering, is mine no otherwise then if I had lived, don, and suffered as he did; as the *Married man* possesseth all which is his *Wives*, and the *Wife* all the goods which are her *Husbands*, for they have all things common, because *they are become one flesh*; and so *Christ* and the *Church* are one *Spirit*, by faith in *Christ*, *Christ's righteousnes* is made our *righteousnes*, and all his are ours, yea, he himselfe is ours. And Tom. 2. page 86. The *righteousnes* by which we are *justified* before *God*, is not in our owne persons, but without our selves in *God*, because man shall have no cause to be puffed up with an opinion of his owne proper *righteousnes* before *God*. And Tom. 2. page 385. A Christian is not formally *righteous*, by reason of any substance or quality in him, but relatively, in relation to *Christ* in whom he hath true *righteousnes*.

Melancthon in *Epist, ad Rom.* 8. 4. saith, wherefore *Pauls* meaning is thus to be taken; That *Christ* is given for us, that we may bee counted to have satisfied the *Law* by him, and that for him wee may be *reputed righteous*; Although we our selves doe not satisfie the *Law*, anothers fulfilling of it freely given to us, and is imputed to us, and so the *Law* is *imputatively* fulfilled in us, and so when the *Apostle* saith that *Christ is the end of the Law for righteousnes to every beleever*; that is, he that hath *Christ* is *righteous*, hee is *reputed* to have satisfied the *Law*, and hee *imputatively* hath that which the *Law* requires. And in *chap. 10. 4.* upon these wordes, *Christ is the end of the Law for righteousnes, &c.* he saith, this is the simple meaning: *Christ is the end: that is, the fulfilling of the Law to the beleever,*
and

and he who hath *Christ*, that is, beleeves in *Christ*, is *righteous*, and hath *imputatively* what the *Law* requires.

The Booke of concord, subscribed by so many hundred *Euangelicall Ministers* of the reformed *Churches* in *Germany*, in the Articles of *Iustification* saith, that when we speake of *iustifying faith*, it is to be knowne, that these three *objects* concur which are to bee *beleeved*. 1. the *promise* of the benefit; that is, *mercy* for *remission* or *iustification*. 2. That the *promise* is most free; which excludes our *merits*, 3. The *merits* of *Chr st*, which are the *price* and *propitiation*, and a little after, *Faith* doth not *iustifie* because it is a *worke* worthy by it selfe; that is in a proper sense, but onely because it receaves the *mercy* promised. And again how shall *Christ* be our *Mediatour*, if in *iustification* wee doe not use him for our *Mediatour*, that is; if we doe not feele, that for him we are reputed *righteous*.

The *Divines* of the *Augustin* confession c ndemne *Osiander*, who held, that the *righteousnes* of *faith* was the essentiall *righteousnes* of *God*; And also them who taught that *Christ* is our *righteousnes* onely according to his humane nature. And in the *Epitome* of the Articles controverted by some, they with one consent affirmed; that the *righteousnes* of *faith* is *remission* of *sinnes*, *reconciliation* to *God*, and *adoption* to be *Sonnes* of *God* for the *obedience* of *Christ* only, which by *faith* alone of meere *grace* is *imputed* to all *believers*. *Articulo 3. de fidei iustitia*. And this *obedience* of *Christ* which is *imputed* for *righteousnes*, they affirme to be the *obedience* which hee performed both in his *death* and *passion*, and also in his fulfilling of the *Law* for our sakes. *Ibid. Artic. 3.* And concerning *faith* they teach, that in *iustification* before *God*, it trusteth neither in *contrition*, nor *love*, nor any other vertues, bnt in *Christ* alone; it is the onely meane and *instrument* which apprehends, and receives the free *grace* of *God*, the *merit* of *Christ* and *remission* of *sinnes*, and it resteth on *Christs* most perfect *obedience*

By which he fulfilled the Law for us, which obedience is imputed to beleevers for righteousness, *Ibid. Artic. 3.*

Calvin is so zealous, and so cleere and manifest in teaching and maintaining the Doctrine of Justification: by the communion and imputation of Christs perfect obedience, satisfaction, and righteousness, that among Christians, Calvins Institutions, me thinkes, the very Father of lyers (the Devill himselfe) should, if not blush and bee ashamed, yet in policy be afraid, to call Calvin for a witnesse against it, least all that heare him, should hate him and hisse him for his open lying.

The Doctrine of Calvin concerning *iustification*, consists of these Ipeciall Articles laid downe plainly.

1. *Institut. lib. 3. cap. 11.* First, hee affirmes in plaine wordes, that *Iustification* consists in *remission* of sinnes, and *imputation* of Christs righteousness. *Sect. 2.*

2. Secondly, he shewes what he meanes by *remission* of sinnes, sometimes he takes *remission* of sinnes in a large sense, for that act of God by which he doth communicate, and impute the full satisfaction of Christ unto his Elect and faithfull, that the whole guilt of all sinnes, both of omission and commission is taken away, and they are no more accounted nor appeare in his sight as sinners: In this sense he calls *remission* of sinnes *totum iustificationis*, in his Comment on Rom. 4. and *totam iustificationem*, whole *iustification*. *Instit. lib. 3. ca. 8. 4.* For indeed when the sinnes of commission are taken away by that part of Christs satisfaction imputed, which is called, his *passive obedience*, or voluntary suffering of the penalties of the Law; and the sinnes of omission by his *active obedience* in fulfilling the righteousness which the Law requires, which is the other part of Christs imputed satisfaction, so that the Elect are now reputed as righteous men, who have the defect which came by Omission supplied, and have no more the sinnes of Omission imputed to them; this is perfect and whole *iustification* (as he truly calls it) But sometimes he useth the word, *remission* of sinnes, in

in a more strict sense, for that part of Gods act of communicating and imputing of Christs satisfaction, which respects the passive obedience of Christ, which takes away the guilt of sinnes committed, but doth not supply the omission of righteousness, and in this sense he makes remission of sinnes but a part of iustification, and Gods imputing of the active part of Christs satisfaction and counting the faithfull righteous by it imputed, hee makes the other part of iustification in the wordes before cited out of his Institutions lib. 3. cap. 11. Sect. 2.

Thirdly, he constantly teacheth and affirmeth; that there is no righteousness by which a man can stand before Gods Tribunal, and be accepted for righteous in his sight, but onely the full satisfaction and perfect righteousness of Christ, which he the Sonne of God performed in the nature of man, for that which is not intire and absolute, and without all staine and spot: (such as never hath beene, nor shall be found in any meere man) can never be accepted of God, but is with him fleighted and vilified beyond all measure; and whosoever prates of any righteousness in mens owne workes or doings, they have no true thought, nor the least sense of the iustice of God, but make a mock of it, Institut. lib. 3. cap. 12. Sect. 1. and 3. and 11. 26.

Fourthly he affirmeth, that man is iustified by faith, when he is excluded from the righteousness of works: & by faith layeth hold on the righteousness of Christ with which he being cloathed, doth appeare in the sight of God, not as a sinner, but as a righteous man. Instit. lib. 3. cap. 11. Sect. 1. And in the same chap. Sect. 11. He saith, *Hac est mirabilis iustificandi ratio, ut Christi iustitia tecti, non exhorreant iudicium quo digni sunt, & dum seipsos merito damnant, iusti extra se censeantur.*

Fiftly concerning the Office of faith in iustification, he teacheth, that faith being in it selfe weake and imperfect, and of no dignity or worth, price or value, is never able to iustifie us by it selfe, but by bringing Christ

unto us, who is given to us for *righteousnes*; it is not our *righteousnes*: but makes us come with the mouth of the soule opened, that we may be capable of *Christ*; and it is as a vessell or Pot; for as the pot full of money enricheth a man, so *faith* filled with *Christ* and his *righteousnes* is said to *justifie* us and to be counted for *righteousnes*; and therefore he saith; that it is a foolish thing to mingle our *faith*, which is onely the *instrument* of receiving *righteousnes*, with *Christ* who is the *materiall cause*, and both the *Author* and *Minister* of this great benefit. chap. 11. Sect. 7. And in the 17. Sect. hee saith, that *faith* is hereupon said to *justifie*, because it doth receive and embrace the *righteousnes* which is offered in the *Gospel*.

6. Sixtly he affirms; that the *righteousnes* by which *beleevers* are *justified* and stand *righteous* before *God*, is, not in themselves but in *Christ*, even his perfect *obedience* and *righteousnes* communicated to them by *imputation* Sect. 23.

7. Lastly he sheweth how this *righteousnes* comes to bee the *righteousnes* of *beleevers*, and to bee so communicated to them, that *God* doth *justifie*, *impute* it to them for *justification*, and accept as if it were their owne; viz. by meanes of their *spirituall union*, and *communion* with *Christ*; by which they are made partakers of *Christ*, and with him and in him possesse all his riches. Sect. 10. and 20. and 23.

This is the sum of *Calvins* Doctrine concerning *justification*, briefly comprized out of his owne words, in places before cited, where the *Reader* may be fully satisfied.

Beza in the doctrine of *justification*, by *faith* doth perfectly agree with *Luther* and *Calvin* in all the former Articles.

First he saith; that *faith* is not any such vertue as doth *justifie* us in our selves before *God*, for that is to set up *faith* in the place of *Christ*: who alone is our whole and perfect *righteousnes*, but *faith* *justifies* as it is the *instrument* which receiveth *Christ*: and with him his *righteousnes*;

ness; that is; most full perfection; and we say that we are *justified* by *faith* onely, because it embraceth *Christ* who doth *justify* us: with whom it doth unite and couple us, that we may be partakers of *him* and all his goods, which being *imputed* to us, are sufficient that wee may be absolved before *God*, and *deemed righteous*; *Confess. cap. 4. Sect. 7. in notis Rom. 3. 23. 24.*

Secondly, that *faith* leads to *Christ* for perfect *righteousnes* to *justification*, and that it assures us of *salvation*, through his *righteousnes* alone, because whatsoever is in *Christ*, is *imputed* to us, as if it were our owne, if so bee we embrace *him* by *faith*; and what the *righteousnes* of *Christ* is which is *imputed* to us, he fully expresseth and describeth to be that greatest and most absolute perfection of *righteousnes*: consisting in these two things. 1. That he hath no sinne in him. 2. That hee hath fulfilled all the *righteousnes* of the *Law*, *cap. 4. Sect. 58. in notis Rom. 3. 22. 26. and Rom. 4. 5. in Phil. 3. 9. Rom. 5. 12.*

Thirdly he sheweth; that we come to have *communion* with *Christ's* *righteousnes*: by *spirituall union* and *marriage* with *Christ*. If (saith he) we be united and joyned together into *fellowship* with *Christ* by *faith*, nothing is more proper ours, then *Christ*, and whatsoever is *Christ's*. *Confess. 4. Sect. 9.*

Fourthly he pronounceth, that it is no lesse then wicked blasphemy, to deny the *mutuall* and *reciprocall imputations* of the *sinnes* of true *beleevers* to *Christ*, and of *Christ's* *righteousnes* to true *beleevers*, in his booke of *justification* against *Anonymus*.

Fifthly he affirmes; that *righteousnes* which *justifies* men before *God*: must be both a *full satisfaction* for sinne; and also a perfect fulfilling of *Gods Commandements* in every part, in *Rom. 3. 20.*

Our learned *Whitakers* worke against *Campion*, in his answer to the 8. reason: page 38. and against *Durans*, lib. 8. page 176. 177. 182, 183. doth stoutly and pithily dispute and maintaine the Doctrine of *justification*, by

the *righteousnes* of *Christ* imputed, which he proves to be the onely perfect *righteousnes*, able to *justifie* us before *God*.

Master *Perkins* also; in his golden *Chaine* (called the order of the causes of *salvation* and *damnation*, chap. 37.) makes the translation of the *beleevers* *sinnes* to *Christ*, and of *Christ's* *righteousnes* to the *beleever*: by a *mutuall* and *reciprocall* *imputation*, the forme of *justification*.

Polanus, in *Synagmate theologico Lib. 6. Cap. 36.* doth maintaine the same *Doctrine*, with *Luther*, *Calvin*, *Beza*, and *Whitaker*: and proves every point fully, by plaine testimonies, and invincible *Arguments*, out of the *holy Scriptures*. In his *Symphonia Catholica*, he brings testimonies of *Ancients*, affirming every Article of our *Doctrine*. And in his *Theses de justifie.* he shewes the consent of *Orthodox Divines* of the reformed Churches.

And that *Musculus*, *Iunius*, and other latter *Divines*, are grossely abused by him, who brings their testimonies to overthrow the *imputation* of *Christ's* *righteousnesse*, will plainly appeare, if any be pleased to reade *Musculus* upon *Rom. 8. 34.* and *16. 3. 4.* where he expounds the *Apostles* wordes of the fulfilling of the *righteousnes* of the *Law* in us, to be meant. First of all *imputatively* by the *righteousnes* of another, even of *Christ* which is also ours, *For we are flesh, of his flesh, &c.* And by the *righteousnes* of *God* he understands *Christ's* perfect *righteousnes* imputed to us.

Also *Iunius*, *Thes. 35.* and *36.* doth affirme, that the *righteousnesse* of faith imputed to *beleevers*, is the *righteousnes* which the *Law* requires, performed by *Christ*; differing onely in this, that *Legall* is every mans fulfilling of the *Law* in his owne person, but this *Evangelicall*, is the fulfilling of the *Law* by *Christ*, *God* and *man* our *surety* and *mediator*.

Thus have I vindicated the *Godly learned*, both *ancient*, and *modern Divines*, from the foule slander, most falsely laid

laid upon them, by this impudent *forger* of false witnesses: and by their owne manifest testimonies, I have made manifest their unanimous consent in the true Doctrine of justification, by the righteousness of Christ, imputed to *believers*, and of them apprehended, and applied by faith.

Now I leave it to all indifferent *Readers*, and zealous *Christians*, to consider, whether it be not their duty, both to take heed to themselves, and to admonish others, that they have no fellowship, with so openly profest *Socinian Sectaries* as this man, and his followers are: you see the *Doctrine* which they maintaine, is *wicked*, and *blasphemous Heresie*: And after many admonitions given by divers grave and learned *Divines*, and often publique *confutations*, and *censures*, passed in publique, they still *persist* in their *pestilent heresy*, & are more mad to *maintain* and *dispute* it then before; and when *truth* cannot helpe them, they flee for helpe to the Father of lyers, and make lyes their *refuge*, and in *forging* lies they *sinne*, being condemned of themselves, even against their *knowledge*, and *conscience*; As the *Apostle* foretold concerning *Hereticks*, *Titus* 3. 11. How wilfully against the knowne *truth*, and his owne *conscience*, this desperate man, hath Proclaimed *Luther*, *Calvin*, *Beza*, *Musculus*, *Iunius*, and others, to be of his opinion, I have sufficiently proved; and if ever he did but looke into any of their writings, his owne eyes would have taught him how opposit they are to his *Heresie*.

As for his rude, impudent, and unmannerly followers, their owne lying and slanderous tongues, proclaime their pedigree from the Father of liers. Let this my answer be by way of *disputation*, and *confutation*, be a witness to free from the false reports which they have dispersed even among divers, who were eye and care witnesses, to the contrary, viz. That Mr. *Goodwin* did *confute* and *confound* me of late, when he came to performe the challenge made by him, or at least, boldly undertaken upon
the

the request of his Disciples, who made and sent it to me, and did so mightily convince me, by the power of his *Arguments*, that first he made me rage through anger and fury, and after made both my Brother and me, to yeeld, and to confesse our former *ignorance*, and *errors*, and to embrace him as one sent from God to turne us from *darknesse* to *light*.

That I promised, and vowed, to renounce my former *Doltrine* of *justification*, if ever God would give me liberty, and to Preach his *Hereticall* opinion: that we besought *him* and all his *Followers* to joyne with us in thanksgiving to God for our *Illumination*, by their Divine Doctor; and in prayer for the *Grace* of *perseverance*, in the light *received*. These reports of us are in our eyes no other, then if they had reported, that *truth* was turned unto *falsehood*, and the Divell become the Father of *truth*: From such Spirits, the God of *truth*, defend his Church, and People, and grant a free passage to his Gospel, and to his *faithfull Ministers* a *Doore* of *utterance*, that they may Preach among all men every where, the unsearchable riches of *Christ*. To that God of *truth*, I consecrate my *tongue* and *pen*, and do resolve with both, to maintaine his *truth*, by his assistance and *grace*, so long as *life*, *breath*, and *strength* shall last: and to him give all *glory*, now and ever.

FINIS.

Impedit ira animum,

ANIMAL
VPON SC
LOOSER AND
IN A WRITTEN I

A DEFENCE OF
meaning of the v
Roman

First dispersed
out the Auth
acknowledg
in, by M

By I O H N

*But this I confesse unto
call Heresie, So worship 7
things which are written in*

*He that is first in his own
bour commeth and searcheth*

*Make no friendship with a
rious man, lest thou learne
Prov. 22. 24, 25.*

Moliturque Genus
Ille suis effec nulli m

Printed in

RSIONS
OF THE
R PASSAGES
INTITVLED,
SENCE AND
ly Apostle.

copies with-
but since
aphed
r.

V I N.

*the way which they
athers, beleaving all
prophets, A&. 24. 14.*

*just, but his neigh-
17.*

*ither goe with the fu-
a snare to thy soule,*

*le, si non
Ovid. Met.*

A.

Columbia University Libraries